

Peter Augustus Jay, of Rhode Island, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Constantinople, Turkey.

Stanton Sickles, of New York, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Brussels, Belgium.

Robert Mason Winthrop, of Massachusetts, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Madrid, Spain.

#### SECOND SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Henry P. Fletcher, of Pennsylvania, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States at Peking, China.

George L. Lorillard, of Rhode Island, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States at Habana, Cuba.

Ulysses Grant Smith, of Pennsylvania, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States at Constantinople, Turkey.

#### CHIEF JUSTICE SUPREME COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Harry M. Clabaugh, of Maryland, to be chief justice of the supreme court of the District of Columbia.

#### ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SUPREME COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Jeter C. Pritchard, of North Carolina, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the District of Columbia.

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John B. Vreeland, of New Jersey, to be attorney of the United States for the district of New Jersey.

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER.

Henry F. Greene, of Minnesota, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

#### DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

S. N. Dexter North, of Boston, Mass., to be Director of the Census in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

#### CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Capt. William W. Harts, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California."

Lieut. Col. Thomas H. Handbury, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California."

#### MEMBERS OF DISTRICT BOARD OF CHARITIES.

John Joy Edson, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the board of charities of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from July 1, 1903.

S. W. Woodward, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the board of charities of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from July 1, 1903.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, November 16, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 13, 1903, was read and approved.

#### SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Hon. Edward B. Vreeland, Representative-elect from the Thirty-seventh district of New York, and Hon. Joseph E. Ransdell, Representative-elect from the Fifth district of Louisiana, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BYRD, for ten days, on account of illness in his family.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House numbered 17, have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to report in lieu thereof the following:

"Resolved, That immediately on the adoption of this rule, and immediately after the reading of the Journal on each day thereafter until the bill herein-after mentioned shall have been disposed of, the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 1921, a bill to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, 1902; that not later than 4 o'clock on November 19 general debate shall be closed in Committee of the Whole, and whenever general debate is closed the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House; and immediately the House shall vote without debate or intervening motion on the engrossment and third reading and on the passage of the bill."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, just a single word in explanation of the rule that has been read at the Clerk's desk. If adopted,

it will bring before the House for immediate consideration the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee on Friday last, a bill to carry out the provisions of the treaty between the Republic of Cuba and the United States.

The resolution provides for general debate until 4 o'clock on Thursday, at which time the committee is to rise and report the bill to the House, and the vote is to be taken on the bill immediately, without intervening motion or debate. The purpose of the resolution is to provide for general debate until 4 o'clock Thursday, unless it shall turn out in the meantime that gentlemen do not desire to speak. In that case the committee will rise and report the bill to the House upon the same conditions as if the debate had continued until 4 o'clock Thursday.

The effect of the rule will be to cut off amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps one of the most drastic rules that has ever been introduced into the House of Representatives. I am not quarreling with the majority members of the Committee on Rules because they have adopted it. A majority party is charged with responsibility not only for legislation, but for methods of procedure in reaching legislation. It takes that full responsibility before the country, and the country is the judge whether it has wisely or unwisely assumed the responsibility. This is a rule to bring onto the floor of the House of Representatives, in Committee of the Whole, without right of amendment from the very beginning, a very important measure—so important in the judgment of the President of the United States that he convened an extraordinary session of the Congress of the United States to consider it. The rule expressly provides that no amendment can be offered; and, being in Committee of the Whole, the necessary incident is that no yeas-and-nays vote can be had upon any proposition presenting itself after the rule has been adopted until the vote upon the bill itself is taken. It shuts off from the House all right to perfect the bill, all right to make it better, all right to go further in the direction in which the bill goes, all right to call a halt upon the direction in which the bill goes, every right of every description that a parliamentary body ought to have.

Now, the minority has wanted to offer an amendment to this bill, and I want to explain the character of that amendment, so as to show how unjust this bill is.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, before I go any further I wish the Chair to inform me, please, when I have spoken ten minutes, as at the end of that time I wish to yield.

The provision that we have wanted to offer to the bill is to strike out the double-barreled pledge contained in the proviso in article 8 of the treaty and repeated in the bill itself verbatim et literatim. That double-barreled pledge is this: First, that this great country shall sit down and tie itself to a given prestatated tariff schedule, so far as the island of Cuba is concerned, not to reduce it either by legislation or otherwise below the rate of duty agreed upon in this bill, and, so far as sugars from other foreign countries, or from foreign countries other than Cuba, to pledge this Government during the continuance of this convention not to reduce the duties upon those sugars from the present Dingley tariff rate at all.

Gentlemen, if the Republican party is prepared to go before the American people, with their magnificent wealth of common sense and common conscience, as the worshipers, the fetich worshipers of fixed tariff schedules, that is its matter. If you think you can "stand pat," as has become the phrase, upon a given duty, and upon all duties, just simply because they happen to be now legislatively fixed, regardless of the wisdom or the unwisdom of them, regardless of the changed conditions of the country, regardless of the fact that many American industries which a few years ago were struggling for the home market now have the foreign market, regardless of the fact that these industries are—many of them—charging more to the American consumer than to the foreign consumer, that again, as a party, is your matter. But it is also somebody else's matter. It is a matter for the Supreme Court behind us both—the people of the United States—and we can safely make our appeal to that tribunal on a rehearing of the case, and they will not be deceived by all your ingenuity in explaining it. You are in power; you are charged with legislation, and amongst other things you are charged with tariff legislation. You stand here before the country telling the country that you are not willing to say that a single solitary schedule upon the bill in existence is not a thing sacred, to be knelt to and worshiped until after the election.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Will the gentleman from Mississippi allow me to ask him a question? Does the gentleman from Mississippi not recognize in that provision anything that will be of benefit to our domestic sugar industry?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am coming to that now. The Democratic party does recognize that the pending bill is a Democratic measure in every principle. [Applause]



on the Democratic side.] The Republican party, after once having taught the sacredness of the schedules, after having once taught that a prohibitive tariff wall is a benefit to this country, comes here now with a bill with a concession of one-fifth, and in that concession made by the Republican party it stultifies itself precisely one-fifth. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Democratic proposition is that whenever you remove the tariff duties down to the competitive point or, approximately, to that point where the American manufacturer or producer is left a fair profit, but without monopolistic power to work extortion on the home consumer while the manufacturer sells cheaper abroad, you have reduced the burden upon the American consumer with general benefit to all.

The Democratic party believes that when on any articles that go to Cuba or any other people on the surface of the earth you get an agreement to reduce the burdens to their consumers by reducing the duties in their markets you have conferred a benefit upon their consumers and also on the American producer, because you enable the consumer in Cuba or elsewhere in any country entering into these reciprocal relations to get the product at a cheaper price. That enables them to buy more of our product. That enables those there who have been buying it to buy more, and enables those who have hitherto not been able to buy any to buy some, and that increases the volume of the consumption of American products and benefits the American producer by enabling him to sell more goods at the old profit, and thus both parties to the trade are benefited.

This bill rests, if it rests at all, upon the old-fashioned Adam Smith and the old-fashioned Walker tariff—the old-fashioned Democratic idea that the more untrammelled trade is, consistently with the necessities of the revenue for a Government economically and effectively administered and consistently also with a desire not ruthlessly and destructively to revolutionize existing conditions by the destruction of honest, legitimate, and nonmonopolistic enterprises, the better. So far as Cuba is concerned, and so far as the United States are concerned in dealing with Cuba in this bill, that is the Democratic position, and you by taking it are stultifying your own usual position.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the balance of my time, or so much of it as he may need for the purpose of discussing the rule, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. As all know, Mr. Speaker, we are assembled here, 386 Members of the House and 90 Members of the Senate, nearly 500 of the representatives—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman from Missouri permit an interruption? Before I sat down, I said that I would read the amendment which we have offered because I want it to appear as part of my remarks. It is as follows:

Strike from the bill the following language, beginning in line 15, page 2, and ending in line 2, page 3:

"Provided, That while said convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon, as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, and no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897."

And insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That upon the making of said agreement, and the issuance of said proclamation, and while said agreement shall remain in force, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in lieu of the duties thereon now provided by law, on all sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color and on all sugar which has gone through a process of refining, imported into the United States, 1.825 cents per pound."

The amendment seeks to strike out that section and to substitute for it the identical amendment which the House passed at the last session, practically using the refiners' differential and disposing of one of the evils inherent in the bill as it now stands.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, this House of 386 Members and a Senate of 90 Members are assembled on the call of the President in extraordinary session, because, in the judgment of the President, an extraordinary matter is to be considered—legislation with reference to the treaty between this country and Cuba. A great many of the President's own party friends believe there was neither occasion nor warrant for the calling of this extraordinary session. But here we are; and the question now before us in the House is whether we are here to meet the responsibilities and to discharge the duties of free, independent, untrammelled representatives of a free, independent, and untrammelled people, or whether we are here to be gagged and tied, upon the very threshold of the proceeding. If the rule which is submitted here and now pending before the House be adopted, the House will be powerless to do anything except to pass or to defeat this bill just as the bill is. It is now, and but for this rule it will continue to be within the power of the House to amend the bill, as in the judgment of a majority it ought to be amended. With this rule adopted that power is taken from the House absolutely. The pertinent question—the question of the hour—is, Shall we deprive ourselves of the right to amend or to consider amendments pro-

posed to this bill? Shall we, at the command of "the powers that be," yield our independent right and shirk our high duty of considering this measure as measures ought to be considered in a body representative of American citizenship?

I am glad to be able to say, I am proud to be able to proclaim, that I believe there is not a solitary vote on this side of the House that will be cast for this rule; that not a solitary gentleman upon this side of the House present and able to vote will refrain from the exercise of that high duty and that great Democratic pleasure of voting against the adoption of the rule.

But we are in the minority. We have not the power to determine the matter by defeating the rule. Whether it shall be adopted does not rest with us, but rests with the men upon the other side of the House, who profess independence and regard for their constituents. I shall make no hypocritical pretense that I am trying to care for those gentleman or that I shall mourn if, as a result of the vote upon this rule, a good many of them are left in the walks of private life and men of my own party shall come here to take their places. I shall not mourn if the people shall write upon their records that final decree which shall terminate their political lives because they have proved unfaithful, because they have gone back upon their professions, and have reversed their course with reference to this important matter as they here but a comparatively short time ago declared it to be.

Do they wish that there shall arise in their own party opposition to them when asking for renomination? Do they wish that if they are successful in gaining renomination they shall be met upon every stump of their districts by opponents of the other party who shall declare, by the record, "This man has been unfaithful to his trust; this man has not carried into Congress that faith which upon the stump he proclaimed, though he pledged himself to do it?"

Not very long ago a measure akin to this was before the House. It differed from this measure, however, in some important particulars. As presented to the House, it provided for an arrangement with Cuba for reciprocal relations on much the basis of this, but with an important provision that as a preliminary to such relations, as the condition upon which they must depend—without the performance of which by Cuba, nothing would be done by us—there should be passed and enforced by the Cuban people labor and immigration laws as stringent and restrictive as our own. The measure before us to-day has no such provision, and no hint of any such provision. Face the laboring men of your districts, ye gentlemen who vote for this rule to deny the opportunity of amendment—face the laboring men of your district, and say to them that deliberately, with your eyes open, under the lash of the party "bosses," you voted for establishing this relation with Cuba, with no provision for the adoption by Cuba of such legislation as I have referred to; that you voted against allowing the opportunity to put into the bill any such amendment. Do you dare to do it? I am not talking to you in the spirit of defiance. If you do this, do it with your eyes open. Do not pretend to your constituents, do not shame yourselves, do not insult your own intellects by the pretense that later on you voted against the bill, when you knew it would pass, though at the outset you voted to make it impossible to put into the bill that wise provision.

If we can amend the bill—if we can have amendments offered to it and considered—I propose, unless some other gentleman gets recognition for the purpose earlier, to offer an amendment to this bill to restore the provision to which I have referred; to restore it in the interest of the laboring men of this country, in pursuance of the policy of this Government, in harmony with our fixed purposes, as declared in legislation time and time again.

Will you do it? Will you make it possible to do it? The real test is upon the adoption of the rule. Do not let any gentleman mistake that. This rule goes either as it is or as you may pretend you would like to have it. The man who votes for the adoption of this rule votes to exclude all possible amendments, including an amendment such as the provision contained in the other bill with reference to immigration—with reference to what might be truly called "pauper labor," the labor of the Asiatic in Cuba. He votes against putting that provision into the bill if he votes for the adoption of this rule.

When this measure, or the measure akin to it, was before the House at the last Congress, there was a good deal of talk about the sugar trust and about the differential duty upon sugar. An amendment was offered by the gentleman from Minnesota not now a Member of this House, but a Federal judge [Mr. Morris], providing for taking off the differential duty on refined sugar—the sugar-trust duty—the duty put there and maintained there for the benefit and the sole benefit of the sugar trust. Enough of the gentlemen upon the other side of the House then—I don't know how it will be now, although this vote will disclose—joining with the solid phalanx of Democracy upon this side, put that amendment into the bill. The bill then, after being passed here, went over to the Senate. It passed here upon the 18th day of



April, 1902. It went to the Senate and died. Died! It was not fought out, it was not killed upon the floor, it was not presented to that body upon its merits, did not go down in the fierce contest of debate, but was strangled to death in the committee room. Why? Because the sugar trust was opposed to it, and because the sugar trust was powerful enough to defeat it.

Do you claim, any of you, that you are opposed to the bill in any form in which it may be put? Do you claim that, amended or not amended, you are going to vote against it? Do you claim that you desire to defeat it? How can you have the best opportunity of defeating it? By putting upon it the amendment which will secure again, as it did before, the active, persistent, relentless hostility of the sugar trust and all its minions wherever they are found. If this bill can be killed at all, amending will kill it as it killed the other bill. I am going to vote for it. This side, in the main, will vote for it. We recognize, as stated by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that it is legislation in the direction in which we would go toward unshackling the wheels of commerce, toward giving freer, better opportunity to the laboring man and the mechanic and the farmer and all the people of this country; because it tends to break down the power of the mighty trusts; because it tends to relieve the American people from oppression and outrages which they have too long endured and which are fast becoming intolerable.

Do you desire to defeat the bill? The way to save the chance to defeat it, the only possible chance to defeat it, is to defeat this rule and amend it. That is the only possible chance for the defeat of this bill. Not a solitary gentleman on either side who has given any attention to the subject, not a well-informed man in the country but knows that, unamended as it is, the bill will become a law. Amended, I do not know what its fate would be, because I know not whether again the sugar trust may be so persuasive, so all powerful as it was before.

Does some one ask, Do you wish to risk the defeat of the bill? Aye, I do wish to risk the defeat of the bill when the choice comes between legislation for the sugar trust and legislation for the American people. If the bill is to go through by purchase from the sugar trust, by subservency to the minions of the sugar trust, then I for one say let it go down into defeat; let it be defeated a thousand times. Let it be defeated forever rather than legislate here, directly or indirectly, for the sugar trust.

Some sixty Republicans in April, 1902, voted with the solid Democracy in this House to amend the other Cuban reciprocity bill, overrode the ruling of the presiding officer, did that extraordinary thing which might be termed rebellion against the management of the House, dared to assert their own individuality and their own representative manhood, dared to speak and to vote for their own constituents rather than surrender judgment and duty at the beck and the command of the powers that be in this House. They have fared tolerably well since. Their constituents seem to have been reasonably well pleased with them. Some forty-odd of them are present here in the House now, and a distinguished array it is. Let me read some of the names. There are MESSRS. BISHOP, BOWERSOCK, BURKETT, CALDERHEAD, CONNER, COOPER of Wisconsin, COUSINS, CRUMPACKER, CUSHMAN, Dahle, DARRAGH, DAVIDSON, DAYTON, ESCH, FORDNEY, GARDNER of Michigan, GREENE of Massachusetts, HAMILTON, HAUGEN, HEPBURN, HITT, HOLLIDAY, HULL, JONES of Washington, LACEY, LAWRENCE, LITTLEFIELD, McCLEARY of Minnesota, McLACHLAN, MANN, MILLER, MUDD, NEEDHAM, POWERS of Massachusetts, PRINCE, ROBERTS, SMITH of Illinois, SAMUEL W. SMITH, WM. ALDEN SMITH, SOUTHARD, STEVENS of Minnesota, TAWNEY, THOMAS of Iowa, and WARNER.

A goodly array! And there are three gentlemen upon this floor who voted against the amendment, who voted to sustain the Chair, and who were so utterly disgusted with the bill after the anti-sugar trust amendment had been put into it, after the sugar trust robbery had by virtue of that amendment been stricken out of it, that they voted against the bill thus amended. These three gentlemen are MESSRS. GROSVENOR, HILDEBRANT, and METCALF.

Now, gentlemen, there is the record made by these Republicans upon this question. What are you going to do? I do not assume to advise you. I do not assume to try to take care of you, but I say to you in all frankness that if you join in upon the sugar-trust side, if you repudiate your record, if you eat up the tags that were put upon you, do not suppose that you can not be identified. [Laughter.] According to the observation of most of us, the gentlemen who asserted their independence in the last Congress carried their heads pretty high after the event. They seemed to be rather gratified with what they had done. They sniffed the air of freedom as though it were both strange and pleasant. [Laughter.] It is said that, with few exceptions, they are back upon the reservation. [Laughter.]

It was remarked that nothing ought now to be said that might jar upon their consciences. I inquired whether they have come back to the reservation with their consciences or whether they

left them off. [Laughter.] I do not know, but let every man who voted for the restrictive immigration and labor laws before, let every man who voted before to put in the amendment which strikes off of sugar the robber duty that goes to the sugar trust let him understand that if he is back on the reservation and proposes now, mayhap for the sake of a good committee assignment—for this reason or that, I know not what and I care not what—to reverse himself and vote the other way, there will be somebody—a good many bodies—found in his own district and in his own party, and a great many of the other party, who will call attention to it and look after it. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall occupy only a very few minutes. I desire to give most of my time to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR.

It is customary when a rule is brought into this House regulating procedure for the minority, whether that minority be a Republican or a Democratic minority, to complain against the drastic nature of the rule. Now, this is a Government by parties. The party in the majority is responsible for legislation. The party in the majority ought, therefore, to be allowed, without criticism or comment, to choose its methods of legislation, only so that in the end it obtains the will of the majority.

My friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] says that this is one of the most drastic rules that was ever brought into this House. I have so often repeated in this House what I am going to say now that it seems as though I might omit it altogether; and yet there are some gentlemen who are Members of the House now who have not been Members of the House heretofore. Do you recollect, gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber, when Mr. Crisp was Speaker of this House and Mr. William L. Wilson was the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means—do you recollect that your committee reported a bill which your President characterized as a measure of perfidy and dishonor; that you sent that bill to the Senate, where it was amended; that you protested time and again that you would never consent to the Senate amendments? That the Senate sent that bill to conference; that while it was in conference and the papers were in the hands of the Senate and not in the hands of the House you passed a rule? Now, what did that rule provide? It provided that you should, by force, in violation of every principle of parliamentary law, bring that bill back into this House and with a very little debate swallow whole the 646 amendments of the Senate? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is it not true that when that was done it was after that bill had been debated for six months?

Mr. DALZELL. There was no debate on a single amendment—the amendments did not even have the chance to be read—in this House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But the gentleman will excuse me a little further?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The bill had been debated here, and the amendments in the Senate, the two together, for six months.

Mr. DALZELL. Why, the mother of the bill would not have recognized it if she had met it in the road. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] It was amended out of all its original shape.

But that is not all. Let me tell you something more. Under that same régime this rule was reported and passed:

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to present for consideration, without reference to a committee, separate bills placing upon the free list sugar in all its forms, coal, iron ore, and barbed wire. Each of said bills when presented shall be considered in the House.

Not in Committee of the Whole!

Thirty minutes' debate—

Think of it!—

shall be allowed on each bill, and at the end of such debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered thereon, and without delay or other motion the vote shall be taken.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

The great sugar industry of this country, the great coal industry of this country, the great metal industry of this country were put upon the free list with fifteen minutes' debate; and yet you gentlemen have the effrontery to rise here to-day and denounce as drastic this resolution. [Applause on the Republican side.] I commend you to a study of your own parliamentary history.

Now, what outrage is there in refusing amendments to this bill? What is this bill? It is not independent tariff legislation. This is a bill to carry out a convention heretofore entered into by the President and the Senate with the Republic of Cuba. It is a



bill to carry out a national pledge, to stand by the national honor, and you gentlemen know that we must take that treaty as it is made or we must leave it. An amendment to this bill would necessitate a new convention between the Republic of Cuba and the United States.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. Under this bill would it not be competent to repeal the sugar differential without affecting the treaty at all?

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all.

Mr. LIND. Why not?

Mr. DALZELL. Because it is not germane to this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LIND. Suppose the House made it so. The House can make anything germane that it chooses. But the explicit question that I wish to put to the gentleman is: Would it not be competent for Congress in this bill to repeal the sugar differential without affecting the treaty as now negotiated in the least?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not think so. But besides, even if that were so, the gentleman from Missouri has just told us that a repeal of the differential would work the defeat of this bill.

I was coming to the point of showing the hypocritical attitude of the Democracy as to this measure. They claim that they are all for it, and yet insist upon an opportunity to offer an amendment which if placed upon it, in the words of their own representative, will work the defeat of the bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is such a thing, as you know, gentlemen, as "playing politics" from time to time.

Now just a word with respect to the "roll of honor" that the gentleman read. To be fair, he ought to recognize the fact that those gentlemen whose names he read were acting upon a legislative proceeding affecting the tariff laws of the country, while this is a bill to carry into effect the provisions of a treaty already made. The difference is material.

I shall not be induced to enter into any tariff discussion at this time. This is not a tariff measure, from my standpoint. I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that so far as being worshippers of any schedules as a fetish is concerned, we recognize the fact that from time to time tariff schedules must be changed to meet the necessities of changed conditions, but we reserve to ourselves the right to say when that time has come when those changes shall be made. [Applause on the Republican side.]

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has twenty minutes remaining.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield that to my colleague on the committee, Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, the direct, immediate question pending here is not a question of what this House may or might do upon an independent bill involving the points that have been suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND]. The question here is a question concrete in form and easily understood by every Member of the House, and about which and the results growing out of which no man here is ignorant. It is a question, pure and simple, whether the House, asserting its power in cooperation with the Senate to control the details of a commercial treaty with a foreign power, is willing, under all the circumstances, to ratify or to consent and approve of the ratification of the commercial treaty made by the President and the Senate. All attempts to sidetrack that issue and to affect that issue by threats of blacklisting and menaces against Members of this House because of any vote they may have taken on some parliamentary question in a former House will not turn aside the intelligence of the American people from the real question here involved.

The attitude of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] is this, put in a simple form: Here is a matter that we are all in favor of. "We Democrats," says that gentleman, in effect, "we want to pass this bill; we are in favor of it because it has something of reciprocity in it, and furthermore, we want to pass it because it reduces the tariff, possibly, contingently upon certain products of a foreign country coming into this country. But we want to mutilate this bill so that no Republican can vote for it and maintain his position toward the protective principles of the party, and then we want to pass it afterwards. We want to make a Democratic child out of it, mutilated, disfigured, ruined in personal appearance, and ruined in all its attributes, and then say, 'This is our child.'" Well, we do not want any of that sort of children to be born in this House of Representatives, and we are not going to consent to it. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The fatherhood of important measures involving politics will be lodged beyond controversy with the Republican party of the House of Representatives, and we propose to maintain the features of the child so that we shall not be ashamed of it, and so that nobody will undertake to swear it on to the Democratic side of the House. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

How did this question come here? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not quite ingenious when he says that it is a question that ought to have a great deal of time and be considered by the amending processes of the House of Representatives in the Committee of the Whole. This question has been discussed, was discussed more or less, during the whole of the Fifty-seventh Congress. We know every argument to-day that will be made to-morrow and the ensuing days. There is not a single germane argument but that Members on this side and that side can repeat as fluently and as easily as they can any of the simple chapters in the simple primers of their childhood. We know all about it. We have discussed the effect that this treaty may possibly have upon some of the productions of this country. We differ about it somewhat; some of us think we are deviating from the great leading idea of protection to all the industries of the United States. Others of us, and I am one of these, believe that if we had passed this bill when it was interfered with by an unfriendly amendment we should long ago practically have forgotten that there was such a question, and no effect unfavorable to any production of the United States would have been realized. But the question has come again, and the President has wisely brought before Congress at an extraordinary session this question of ratifying this treaty.

Are we now, for the mere purpose of standing by some former record, by repeating these oft-repeated attacks on the sugar trust, to defeat this treaty? That is all there is of it. Would the gentleman from Missouri be willing to take the responsibility, under all the circumstances, of defeating the ratification of this treaty and the closing out of these questions between the United States and Cuba?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish an answer? If he wishes an answer, I will say yes, with the other alternative of voting for the sugar trust to get it through.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I believe the gentleman from Missouri was present in the House of Representatives at the time of the famous 600 amendments, one of the most important of which was tacked on and written by or for the sugar trust, as we have always been told, and without any debate he shut his eyes and swallowed that amendment. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman one question in connection with the question which he asked the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If it be true that putting upon this bill an amendment to strike down the differential, and thereby decrease to some extent the power of the sugar trust to extort upon the consumer and dictate to American commerce, would defeat the bill, would it not defeat it in a Republican Senate and by the action of that Republican Senate? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. The trouble with the gentleman is that he and I differ wholly upon the effect of the repeal of the differential. In my opinion no more unwise assault was ever made upon the principle of protection in this country than the repeal of the differential duty on refined sugar. I believe that the Cuban reciprocity provision of the treaty will be innocuous so far as regards any injury to the sugar trust of the country; but I know, as the gentleman from Mississippi knows, and as the gentleman from Missouri has clearly admitted by talking about the interests of the laboring men in the purchase of sugar, that if you take away the protection we have to-day against the refined sugar of Germany and France and kindred producers, which amounts to nearly two-thirds of the amount of sugar produced in the world, you have destroyed the last vestige of power of the sugar producers of the United States, for the refined sugar of those countries would come into this country at a lower rate in the market than the present price of crude sugar, as I believe. So I am not terrified by any argument of that character.

What I am aiming at is this: The gentleman from Missouri says that he is willing to defeat this treaty. I can understand that, Mr. Speaker, perfectly well. The gentleman and his party owe nothing to the promise, and the attempt to fulfill that promise, implied, if not expressed, made by the Administration in this country. I am willing to take upon myself the burden of stating that no duty was ever more seriously incumbent upon the President of the United States than was made incumbent upon the present President of the United States by the action of his predecessor and by the concurrent history of the period in which this question grew up. The duty devolved upon him to try to carry into effect the treaty which we are to vote upon next Thursday. Bravely and truly he has discharged the great duty of his office; and I am here to defend him and his Administration and those who have stood by him here and in the other legislative branch of the Government against any assault that may be made upon them in this behalf during the progress of this debate.

Let us see. When this rule is adopted, as I trust it will be, the



gentlemen on the other side will proceed to assail the Administration; they will proceed to assail this treaty. And yet when the crucial hour comes, the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Mississippi tell us, they will, practically in solid phalanx, vote for the bill, thereby indorsing the Administration; and every attempt here to tangle up the machinery that is running in the right direction is an attempt to impede the Administration in the discharge of its plain duty.

Some gentleman on the other side whom I did not recognize asked my colleague whether it would not be a valid law if the House of Representatives should put upon the bill the repeal of the differential and send it to the Senate. I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. The subject-matter of this bill is not the repeal of any item of the schedules of the tariff bill. The subject-matter of this bill is the approval of the House and the Senate acting conjointly of the treaty under consideration—not the repeal of some other law, but the establishment of this treaty upon a permanent footing. I do not believe, therefore, that such an enactment as has been spoken of would have the slightest valid effect. But suppose that it would. Now come the gentlemen on the other side who say they want this treaty ratified, and then comes the proposition to put upon this bill a provision that would defeat the treaty. They would defeat the treaty in order to do—what? To defeat the very thing they say they want, the very thing that they are going to vote for, the very thing (and I speak respectfully, without any menace) that they dare not vote against. And yet they would make it inoperative and void and valueless simply to “play politics” in the face of the American people.

Gentlemen on the other side, when the proper time comes it may be possible that we shall point out to you some of the other political “plays” that you have made, and one other which I imagine you will bring upon the boards in that stately procession of the grand entrée of a new question that you will speak upon and break your necks upon, if you have an opportunity. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

It is said that gentlemen on this side who voted to override the judgment of the Chair when this question was up before will be put in a very awkward position when the black list of the gentleman from Missouri is read. Well, now, let us see. Those gentlemen voted in the first place to overrule the Chair; and then every Democrat in the House voted to put on the bill the repeal of the differential. It was simply the purpose of a certain number of gentlemen on this side of the House, acting under their responsibility as Members of the House, to defeat a bill to which they were opposed fully and upon principle as they understood it. And they took all the various roads to the result. They overruled the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House.

We do not propose on this particular occasion to permit such a question as that to be raised, if we can possibly help it, and there is not a parliamentarian on the other side of the House who does not know that the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not germane to this bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without consuming any more time, I hope that the Members of this House upon this side of the House and the gentlemen of this House on the other side who really desire the passage of this bill and the elimination from further consideration of all that there is in this vexed question will vote now to adopt this rule, which no man doubts is absolutely legitimate and fair.

What was the alternative? Why, if this provision against amendments had not been embodied in this resolution, then will come the same old question, and I undertake to say that there is not one gentleman on this side of the House, nor do I believe there are many on that side of the House, who would have held that the vote to override the opinion of the Chair upon a bill such as we have here is an authority which would have justified their voting in the same direction upon a mere approval of a treaty duly entered into by the Executive and the Senate and confining itself to the particular items of the treaty itself. I think that it is easy to differentiate the two questions. I think the distinguishing marks of the two questions are wide apart and that there is no inconsistency in voting upon that question that it was legitimate and fair and just to amend that bill, while an attempt to destroy this procedure and defeat this committee by a similar attempt would stand upon a different footing and be totally and utterly without precedent in parliamentary proceedings. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we shall stand together and bring straight before this House and before our Democratic friends on the other side and before the country the great, the real question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves the previous question on the adoption of the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on that question I think we may as well have the yeas and nays, to save time.

The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote being taken, there were—yeas 184, nays 160, answered “present” 3, not voting 38, as follows:

## YEAS—184.

Adams, Pa.	Dovenor,	Kennedy,	Porter,
Adams, Wis.	Draper,	Ketcham,	Powers, Me.
Alexander,	Dresser,	Kinkaid,	Powers, Mass.
Allen,	Driscoll,	Knapp,	Prince,
Ames,	Dunwell,	Knopf,	Reeder,
Babcock,	Dwight,	Kyle,	Roberts,
Bartholdt,	Esch,	Lacey,	Rodenberg,
Bates,	Evans,	Lafean,	Scott,
Bede,	Flack,	Landis, Chas. B.	Sherman,
Beidler,	Foss,	Landis, Frederick	Sibley,
Birdsall,	Foster, Vt.	Lanning,	Skiles,
Bishop,	French,	Lawrence,	Slemp,
Bowersock,	Fuller,	Lilley,	Smith, Ill.
Bradley,	Gaines, W. Va.	Littauer,	Smith, Iowa
Brandegge,	Gardner, Mass.	Littlefield,	Smith, Samuel W.
Brick,	Gardner, Mich.	Longworth,	Smith, Pa.
Brooks,	Gardner, N. J.	Lorimer,	Snapp,
Brown, Pa.	Gibson,	Loudenslager,	Southard,
Brown, Wis.	Gillet, N. Y.	Lovering,	Southwick,
Brownlow,	Gillett, Cal.	McCall,	Spalding,
Buckman,	Gillett, Mass.	McCarthy,	Sperry,
Burke, S. Dak.	Goebel,	McClary, Minn.	Stafford,
Burkett,	Graff,	McCreary, Pa.	Steenerson,
Burleigh,	Greene,	McLachlan,	Sterling,
Burton,	Grosvenor,	Mann,	Stevens, Minn.
Butler, Pa.	Hamilton,	Marsh,	Sulloway,
Calderhead,	Haskins,	Marshall,	Tawney,
Campbell,	Haugen,	Martin,	Thomas, Iowa
Capron,	Hedge,	Metcalf,	Tirrell,
Cassel,	Hemenway,	Miller,	Townsend,
Conner,	Henry, Conn.	Minor,	Van Voorhis,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	Mondell,	Volstead,
Cousins,	Hermann,	Moon, Pa.	Vreeland,
Cromer,	Hildebrandt,	Morgan,	Wachter,
Crumpacker,	Hill, Conn.	Morrell,	Wanger,
Currier,	Hinshaw,	Murdoch,	Warner,
Curtis,	Hitt,	Needham,	Warnock,
Dalzell,	Holliday,	Norris,	Watson,
Daniels,	Howell, N. J.	Olmsted,	Weems,
Davidson,	Howell, Utah	Otis,	Wiley, N. J.
Davis, Minn.	Huff,	Otjen,	Williamson,
Dayton,	Hughes, W. Va.	Overstreet,	Wilson, Ill.
Deemer,	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker,	Woodyard,
Dick,	Jackson, Ohio	Patterson, Pa.	Wright,
Dixon,	Jenkins,	Payne,	Young,
Douglas,	Jones, Wash.	Perkins,	The Speaker.

## NAYS—160.

Adamson,	Fordney,	Lind,	Ryan,
Aiken,	Foster, Ill.	Little,	Scarborough,
Baker,	Gaines, Tenn.	Livernash,	Scudder,
Ball,	Garber,	Livingston,	Shackleford,
Bankhead,	Garner,	Lloyd,	Shafroth,
Bartlett,	Gilbert,	Loud,	Sheppard,
Bassett,	Gillespie,	Lucking,	Sherley,
Beall, Tex.	Glass,	McAndrews,	Shober,
Bell, Cal.	Goldfogle,	McClellan,	Shull,
Benny,	Gooch,	McDermott,	Sims,
Benton,	Granger,	McLain,	Slayden,
Bowers,	Gregg,	McMorran,	Small,
Bowie,	Griffith,	McNary,	Smith, Ky.
Brantley,	Gudger,	Macon,	Smith, Tex.
Breazeale,	Hamlin,	Maddox,	Snook,
Broussard,	Hardwick,	Mahoney,	Southall,
Burgess,	Harrison,	Meyer, Ia.	Sparkman,
Burnett,	Hay,	Miers, Ind.	Spight,
Butler, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Moon, Tenn.	Stanley,
Caldwell,	Hill, Miss.	Padgett,	Stephens, Tex.
Candler,	Hitchcock,	Page,	Sullivan, Mass.
Cassingham,	Hogg,	Patterson, N. C.	Sullivan, N. Y.
Clark,	Hopkins,	Patterson Tenn.	Sulzer,
Clayton,	Howard,	Pierce,	Swanson,
Cochran,	Howell, Pa.	Pou,	Talbot,
Cooper, Tex.	Hughes, N. J.	Pujo,	Tate,
Cowherd,	Humphreys, Miss.	Rainey,	Taylor,
Croft,	Hunt,	Randell, Tex.	Thayer,
Crowley,	James,	Ransdell, La.	Thomas, N. C.
Davey, La.	Johnson,	Reid,	Thompson,
De Armond,	Jones, Va.	Rhea,	Trimble,
Denny,	Kehoe,	Richardson, Ala.	Underwood,
Dickerman,	Kline,	Richardson, Tenn.	Vandiver,
Dinsmore,	Kluttz,	Rixey,	Wade,
Dougherty,	Lamar, Fla.	Robb,	Wallace,
Emerich,	Lamar, Mo.	Robertson, La.	Webb,
Field,	Legare,	Robinson, Ark.	Williams, Ill.
Finley,	Lester,	Robinson, Ind.	Williams, Miss.
Fitzpatrick,	Lever,	Rucker,	Wynn,
Flood,	Lewis,	Russell,	Zenor.

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3.

Boutell,

Lamb,

Mahon.

## NOT VOTING—38.

Acheson,	Davis, Fla.	Kitchin, Claude	Shiras,
Badger,	Fitzgerald,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bingham,	Fowler,	Lindsay,	Smith, N. Y.
Brundidge,	Goulden,	Maynard,	Van Duzer,
Burk, Pa.	Griggs,	Mudd,	Wadsworth,
Burleson,	Hearst,	Nevin,	Weisse,
Byrd,	Houston,	Palmer,	Wiley, Ala.
Cooper, Pa.	Hull,	Pearre,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cushman,	Jackson, Md.	Rider,	
Darragh,	Keliher,	Ruppert,	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the Speaker, and he voted in the affirmative. So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a permanent pair with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GRIGGS, who is at home on account of illness in his family. I therefore desire to change my vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman.



The Clerk called the name of Mr. BOUTELL, and he voted "present."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. BYRD, is at home because of sickness in his family. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. NEVIN, is confined to his house by illness. That is the reason why he is not present.

The SPEAKER. These various statements are not in order. It is by unanimous consent that they have been made.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

For one week:

Mr. MUDD with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Until Saturday next:

Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. BYRD.

Until Monday next:

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. LAMB.

For this day:

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania with Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.

Mr. SHIRAS with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. HOUSTON.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. HEARST.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. BADGER.

Mr. HULL with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. NEVIN with Mr. VAN DUZER.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. JACKSON of Maryland with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.

On this vote:

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my vote. I am

paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. WADSWORTH.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. LAMB, and he voted "present."

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania, Mr. WANGER, vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the gentleman

from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER] did vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the reso-

lution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in order to save

time we might just as well have the yeas and nays on that now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi demands the

yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken on agreeing to the resolution; and there

were—yeas 181, nays 159, answered "present" 4, not voting 41, as

follows:

#### YEAS—181.

Adams, Pa.	Dresser,	Kinkaid,	Powers, Mass.
Adams, Wis.	Driscoll,	Knapp,	Prince,
Alexander,	Dunwell,	Knopf,	Reeder,
Allen,	Dwight,	Kyle,	Roberts,
Ames,	Esch,	Lacey,	Rodenberg,
Babcock,	Evans,	Lafean,	Scott,
Bartholdt,	Flack,	Landis, Chas. B.	Sherman,
Bates,	Foss,	Landis, Frederick	Sibley,
Bede,	Foster, Vt.	Lanning,	Skiles,
Beidler,	French,	Lawrence,	Slemp,
Birdsall,	Fuller,	Lilley,	Smith, Ill.
Bishop,	Gaines, W. Va.	Littauer,	Smith, Iowa
Bowersock,	Gardner, Mass.	Littlefield,	Smith, Samuel W.
Bradley,	Gardner, Mich.	Longworth,	Smith, Pa.
Brandegge,	Gardner, N. J.	Lorimer,	Snapp,
Brick,	Gibson,	Loudenslager,	Southard,
Brown, Pa.	Gillet, N. Y.	Lovering,	Southwick,
Brown, Wis.	Gillett, Cal.	McCall,	Spalding,
Brownlow,	Gillett, Mass.	McCarthy,	Sperry,
Buckman,	Goebel,	McCleary, Minn.	Stafford,
Burke, S. Dak.	Graff,	McCreary, Pa.	Steenerson,
Burkett,	Greene,	McLachlan,	Sterling,
Burleigh,	Grosvenor,	Mann,	Stevens, Minn.
Burton,	Hamilton,	Marsh,	Sulloway,
Butler, Pa.	Haskins,	Marshall,	Thomas, Iowa
Calderhead,	Haugen,	Martin,	Tirrell,
Campbell,	Hedge,	Metcall,	Townsend,
Capron,	Hemenway,	Miller,	Van Voorhis,
Cassel,	Henry, Conn.	Minor,	Volstead,
Conner,	Hepburn,	Mondell,	Vreeland,
Cooper, Wis.	Hermann,	Moon, Pa.	Wachter,
Cousins,	Hildebrandt,	Morgan,	Wanger,
Cromer,	Hill, Conn.	Morrell,	Warner,
Crumpacker,	Hinshaw,	Murdock,	Warnock,
Currier,	Hitt,	Needham,	Watson,
Curtis,	Holliday,	Norris,	Weems,
Dalzell,	Howell, N. J.	Olmsted,	Wiley, N. J.
Daniels,	Howell, Utah	Otis,	Williamson,
Davidson,	Huff,	Otjen,	Woodyard,
Davis, Minn.	Hughes, W. Va.	Overstreet,	Wright,
Deemer,	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker,	Young,
Dick,	Jackson, Ohio	Patterson, Pa.	The Speaker.
Dixon,	Jenkins,	Payne,	
Douglas,	Jones, Wash.	Perkins,	
Dovener,	Kennedy,	Porter,	
Draper,	Ketcham,	Powers, Me.	

#### NAYS—159.

Adamson,	Flood,	Lewis,	Scarborough,
Aiken,	Fordney,	Lind,	Scudder,
Baker,	Foster, Ill.	Little,	Shackleford,
Ball,	Gaines, Tenn.	Livernash,	Shafroth,
Bankhead,	Garber,	Lloyd,	Sheppard,
Bartlett,	Garner,	Loud,	Sherley,
Bassett,	Gilbert,	Lucking,	Shober,
Beall, Tex.	Gillespie,	McAndrews,	Shull,
Bell, Cal.	Glass,	McClellan,	Sims,
Benny,	Goldfogle,	McDermott,	Slayden,
Benton,	Gooch,	McLain,	Small,
Bowers,	Granger,	McMorran,	Smith, Ky.
Bowie,	Gregg,	McNary,	Smith, Tex.
Brantley,	Griffith,	Macon,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Breazeale,	Gudger,	Maddox,	Snook,
Brooks,	Hamlin,	Mahoney,	Southall,
Broussard,	Hardwick,	Miers, Ind.	Sparkman,
Burgess,	Harrison,	Moon, Tenn.	Spight,
Burnett,	Hay,	Padgett,	Stanley,
Butler, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Page,	Stephens, Tex.
Caldwell,	Hill, Miss.	Patterson, N. C.	Sullivan, Mass.
Candler,	Hitchcock,	Patterson, Tenn.	Sullivan, N. Y.
Cassingham,	Hogg,	Pierce,	Sulzer,
Clark,	Hopkins,	Pou,	Swanson,
Clayton,	Howard,	Pujo,	Talbot,
Cochran,	Howell, Pa.	Rainey,	Tate,
Cooper, Tex.	Hughes, N. J.	Randell, Tex.	Taylor,
Cowherd,	Humphreys, Miss.	Ransdell, La.	Thayer,
Croft,	Hunt,	Reid,	Thomas, N. C.
Crowley,	James,	Rhea,	Thompson,
Davey, La.	Johnson,	Richardson, Ala.	Trimble,
De Armond,	Jones, Va.	Richardson, Tenn.	Underwood,
Denny,	Kehoe,	Rixey,	Vandiver,
Dickerman,	Kline,	Robb,	Wade,
Dinsmore,	Kluttz,	Robertson, La.	Wallace,
Dougherty,	Lamar, Fla.	Robinson, Ark.	Webb,
Emerich,	Lamar, Mo.	Robinson, Ind.	Williams, Miss.
Field,	Legare,	Rucker,	Wynn,
Finley,	Lester,	Russell,	Zenor.
Fitzpatrick,	Lever,	Ryan,	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Boutell,	Dayton,	Lamb,	Mahon.
----------	---------	-------	--------

#### NOT VOTING—41.

Acheson,	Fitzgerald,	Lindsay,	Smith, N. Y.
Badger,	Fowler,	Livingston,	Van Duzer,
Bingham,	Goulden,	Maynard,	Wadsworth,
Brundidge,	Griggs,	Meyer, La.	Weisse,
Burk, Pa.	Hearst,	Mudd,	Wiley, Ala.
Burleson,	Houston,	Nevin,	Williams, Ill.
Byrd,	Hull,	Palmer,	Wilson, Ill.
Cooper, Pa.	Jackson, Md.	Pearre,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cushman,	Kellher,	Rider,	
Darragh,	Kitchin, Claude	Ruppert,	
Davis, Fla.	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Shiras,	

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER] is recorded as voting?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. DAYTON. I voted "yea." I have a general pair with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER], and desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The name of Mr. DAYTON was called, and he voted "present."

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.

On this vote:

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. JACKSON of Ohio with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

#### CUBA.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to the House a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that the rule just adopted be amended thus far: That there be given a yea-and-nay vote upon an amendment proposed to be offered by the minority, with twenty minutes' discussion on a side on the amendment, and that then there be taken directly after that, by unanimous consent, the vote upon the pending bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, after the announcement made by the other side that the adoption of that amendment means the killing of the bill, I am under the painful necessity of making objection.

The SPEAKER. There is objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I shall not endeavor to debate the question of unanimous consent, but I am satisfied the gentleman from New York does not wish to make an erroneous statement.

The SPEAKER. Nevertheless it amounts to an objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask to correct an erroneous statement made by the gentleman. No such statement as that has been made. It has been suggested that possibly the Republican Senate might kill it if it hurt the sugar trust, nothing else.

The SPEAKER. One moment. There is a message from the President, and if there be no objection it will be laid before the House at this time. The Chair hears no objection.



## PANAMA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

In response to a resolution of the House of Representatives of November 9, 1903, requesting the President "to communicate to the House, if not, in his judgment, incompatible with the interests of the public service, all correspondence and other official documents relating to the recent revolution on the Isthmus of Panama," I transmit herewith copies of the papers called for.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, November 16, 1903.

## CUBA.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the terms of the order just adopted, the House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill mentioned in the order, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union under the rule just adopted by the House, which the Clerk will again report, for the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will report after reading the order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House No. 17, have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to report in lieu thereof the following:

"Resolved, That immediately on the adoption of this rule, and immediately after the reading of the Journal on each day thereafter until the bill hereinafter mentioned shall have been disposed of, the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 1921, 'A bill to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, 1902;' that not later than 4 o'clock on November 19 general debate shall be closed in Committee of the Whole, and whenever general debate is closed the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House; and immediately the House shall vote without debate or intervening motion on the engrossment and third reading and on the passage of the bill."

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902.

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the President of the United States shall receive satisfactory evidence that the Republic of Cuba has made provision to give full effect to the articles of the convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902, he is hereby authorized to issue his proclamation declaring that he has received such evidence, and thereupon on the tenth day after exchange of ratifications of such convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, and so long as the said convention shall remain in force, all articles of merchandise being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba which are now imported into the United States free of duty shall continue to be so admitted free of duty, and all other articles of merchandise being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba imported into the United States shall be admitted at a reduction of 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon, as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, or as may be provided by any tariff law of the United States subsequently enacted. The rates of duty herein granted by the United States to the Republic of Cuba are and shall continue during the term of said convention preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries: *Provided*, That while said convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon, as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, and no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held or construed as an admission on the part of the House of Representatives that customs duties can be changed otherwise than by an act of Congress originating in said House.

SEC. 2. That so long as said convention shall remain in force the laws and regulations adopted or that may be adopted by the United States to protect the revenues and prevent fraud in the declarations and proofs that the articles of merchandise to which said convention may apply are the product or manufacture of the Republic of Cuba shall not impose any additional charge or fees therefor on the articles imported, excepting the consular fees established, or which may be established, by the United States for issuing shipping documents, which fees shall not be higher than those charged on the shipments of similar merchandise from any other nation whatsoever; that articles of the Republic of Cuba shall receive, on their importation into the ports of the United States, treatment equal to that which similar articles of the United States shall receive on their importation into the ports of the Republic of Cuba; that any tax or charge that may be imposed by the national or local authorities of the United States upon the articles of merchandise of the Republic of Cuba embraced in the provisions of said convention subsequent to importation and prior to their entering into consumption into the United States shall be imposed and collected without discrimination upon like articles whencesoever imported.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi. I would like to know if he desires to make any request with reference to the division of the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from New York to make a statement of the virtual agreement which we entered into.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, in the committee the gentleman made the suggestion that the debate close on Thursday at 4 o'clock, substantially as provided in the rule, and also expressed the desire that the time should be controlled by the gentleman

from Mississippi and myself, each controlling half of the time. If that is agreeable to him, I make the request here for unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. PAYNE (continuing). Although I do not covet the job of dividing the time; but I will make the request in conformity with the agreement made in the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. It was understood that two hours of the time would be reserved for me.

Mr. PAYNE. It comes out of the time of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It was understood that I would yield two hours of my time for the use of the gentleman from Louisiana, for the use of those Members upon this side of the Chamber who were opposed to the measure. So that two hours of my time will be at the disposal of the gentleman from Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time between now and 4 o'clock on Thursday afternoon be equally divided between the two sides of the House, that the time upon the Republican side be controlled by the gentleman from New York, and that upon the Democratic side by the gentleman from Mississippi. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the question of reciprocity with Cuba came before the country some three years ago. It was, as is well known, in accordance with the desires and designs of the late President McKinley that relations of this kind should be entered into between the United States and the infant Republic. Two years ago the President of the United States, in his message, laid the matter before Congress, and in pursuance of that recommendation a bill was introduced in the House, where revenue legislation under the Constitution properly commences, was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and finally reported to the House and considered; after a long debate an amendment was offered on this side of the Chamber. It was stated openly in the House that that amendment was offered for the express purpose of killing the bill. That was the frank and open statement of gentlemen upon this side of the House and what was to be expected of gentlemen on this side of the Chamber. On the other side of the House we were told, as we are told to-day, that they were in favor of the treaty; that, figuratively speaking, they were crying for the treaty and desired to have it passed, and still they were for this amendment, which they believed then and which they state to-day will kill the bill and kill the proposition that came before the House.

But the agitation did not stop. The people of the country have been discussing it, the newspapers have discussed it, and the people of the country have become impressed with the position that was taken by the President of the United States two years ago and by the majority of the House—that the time had come for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba. Various arguments were brought forward. It was stated that we owed it to Cuba; that it was an obligation imposed upon us. At that time, Mr. Chairman, I stated to the House that I saw no other obligations on the part of this country to Cuba than that which a guardian had toward his ward; that we had administered the estate properly, justly, honestly, and honorably; that we had turned over the whole estate to our ward, and still we owed the ward that which every high-minded guardian feels incumbent upon him to do for his ward in every walk in life, and that is to see to it that the ward is started out on the right path; to see to it that the Republic of Cuba in taking her place among the nations of the earth is started out on the right path, and not only with the blessing, but the substantial benediction of the people of the United States.

Our relations with Cuba were peculiar. We had entered upon a war unheard of in history—a war for a sentimental reason. The people lying at our very doors were oppressed with taxation and downtrodden, and had been oppressed for centuries, and we thought it our duty as a people to come to their rescue. We spent our blood and our treasure to free them from the bonds of Spain, and a close relationship had grown up between us. An interest had grown up in the minds of the people of the United States, and it seemed to us that it was incumbent upon us as a great nation, out of our wealth, out of our surplus in the Treasury, out of our overflowing taxation which greatly exceeded our expenditures, to do something for the Republic of Cuba, and hence this bill was brought into the House. What action was taken upon it in the other body I will not state, except what appears from the official record. The Executive took the matter up again. He negotiated this treaty which has been brought before the House, a treaty that was ratified by the Senate of the United States in March last, with the condition that it should receive the approval of the Congress. That brings the question here to this House.

The President deemed it so important that he called the Congress



together in extraordinary session. He sent a special message on the second day of our session to the House, again urging in the most emphatic language that we should carry out the spirit of his message of two years ago. We examined the treaty as it came from the Senate. There were some provisions in it that might seem to imply that the House of Representatives had not, under the Constitution, the sole prerogative of originating revenue legislation. There was this proviso in the treaty, evidently placed there for the benefit of the sugar-beet raisers of the United States and the cane growers of the States of Louisiana and Texas, evidently put there to help them out, and yet which, by implication, if adopted by the House, might seem to imply that we yielded the constitutional prerogative which has ever been lodged in this body. It became necessary, Mr. Chairman, to provide that by adopting the language of the treaty so far as it affected our revenue it should not be deemed a precedent. In 1854 we had a treaty with Great Britain providing reciprocal trade relations between this country and Canada, and that treaty itself provided that it should not go into effect until Congress had passed an enabling act to carry into effect the provisions of the treaty, and the House and the Senate passed and the Executive finally signed it, and it then became a law and put the treaty into effect.

The same thing was done in the case of Hawaii. So we are not without a precedent upon this question; and precedent was a clear guide as to what we should do. We adopted in our bill the provisions of the treaty which regulate or change duties upon goods imported into this country. But we came across this proviso about which I spoke a moment ago:

*Provided, That while said convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon, as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897.*

So far it invaded no constitutional prerogative. But these words were added:

*And no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897.*

Here by implication was advanced the idea that by treaty or convention tariff duties could be changed. Your committee were unanimously of the opinion that we could not enter into any legislation which would give this implied construction to the Constitution of the United States. Some day this question may come before the Supreme Court, provided two-thirds of the other branch of Congress should ever attempt to change tariff rates by treaty or convention; and if this question should ever come before the Supreme Court we did not propose to have it go there with that implication in our bill. So we adopted this further proviso:

*And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be held or construed as an admission on the part of the House of Representatives that customs duties can be changed otherwise than by an act of Congress, originating in said House.*

The other provisions of the bill, as I said, are simply provisions covering the provisions of the treaty whenever they change tariff rates on goods coming into the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having said this much about the history of this legislation, let us see what effect it is to have, first upon the United States, and then upon the Republic of Cuba. It affects our revenues. We collect in tariff duty upon goods imported into the United States from Cuba somewhere about \$28,000,000 a year. If we take off 20 per cent of those revenues, as provided in this bill, it will make a reduction of between five or six million dollars in our revenues. This revenue we give up, and it goes out of the Treasury. I think the Treasury can afford to lose it, so far as the receipts and expenditures are concerned. It is true that during the first four months of this fiscal year the expenditures exceeded the revenue by something like one million and a half of dollars. Always at the beginning of the fiscal year the expenditures are great. The expenditures and the receipts during the first four months of a fiscal year have during the last half dozen years shown a greater proportion of expenditures in comparison with receipts than the latter part of the year. At the beginning of the fiscal year the Departments are waiting for the appropriations. Various matters are perfected ready for paying out the money when the appropriations become available on the 1st of July. But we have not experienced any deficiency under the Dingley Act until the present time, when the expenditures have for four months exceeded the receipts by \$2,000,000. Yet Treasury experts say, and every man who has examined this proposition will say, that before the year is over our receipts will exceed our expenditures by a sum greater than this remission of five or six million dollars to Cuba. So that there is no danger to the revenue through the passage of this measure.

Will it affect injuriously any American industry? In the former debate we heard a great deal about the sugar industry in this country—an industry of which I have been a friend ever since I

heard of it. I heard of it first when we were preparing the Dingley bill; and I have heard of it upon subsequent occasions when there has been an agitation of the tariff. I have ever been the consistent friend of that industry—always anxious to give it that fair meed of protection to which it was entitled as a promising industry under our tariff laws. Does the bill seriously affect the beet-sugar industry in this country? When we framed the Dingley bill in the House, Mr. Chairman, we imposed a duty of \$1.65 per hundred upon sugars 96 degrees test; and in that act we inserted a provision for reciprocity with any country that produced sugar, allowing the President to make the bargain by which 8 per cent of that duty should be taken off, which would reduce it, I believe, to about \$1.50 per hundred pounds.

That was the bill as it passed the House, that was the bill which gentlemen upon this side of the House, friends of the beet-sugar industry, all voted for, in common with myself. It was our judgment that even if the rate of duty were reduced upon every pound of sugar coming into the United States to \$1.50 per hundred pounds, there would still be sufficient protection to the beet-sugar industry. This reduction of 8 per cent applied to duties upon all grades of sugar, including refined sugar. The bill went over to the Senate, and the Senate increased the rate to \$1.68½ per hundred pounds. They struck out our third section of the bill and substituted one of their own. Finally we compromised by adopting both of them as they appeared in the bill as it was passed. But, Mr. Chairman, everybody in the House knew that we had another object in arranging the schedule in reference to the tariff on sugar, and that was for the sake of the revenue produced under the bill. We believed that a lower rate of duty was ample protection to encourage and foster the beet-sugar industry. We believed that a lower rate of duty was sufficient to take care of the sugar industries of the States of Louisiana and Texas. We believed that we could safely report a bill which was protective as to those industries and at the same time could have a considerable proportion of this duty which we placed upon sugar for the needs of the revenue.

Under the Wilson bill we had fallen behind in the revenue, and the object of a Republican bill always is to produce revenue as well as protection. A Democratic bill, as, for instance, the Wilson-Gorman enormity, was neither protective nor did it supply sufficient revenue to support the Government. It was wrong at both ends. They profess the principle of tariff for revenue only with incidental protection. They did not get the protection incidental, nor did they get the revenue under their bill; and so it is that we put the rate of duty higher on sugar than was absolutely necessary because we could get this splendid revenue from the sugar duty, a revenue that came from the people of the United States who use sugar in their households. From this, Mr. Chairman, it will be easily seen that a reduction of 20 per cent upon the high rate of duty put in the bill by the Senate, which went into the law, does not cut down the rate of duty on sugar so as to imperil for one moment any single industry in the United States, the cane or the beet sugar industry. That is the reason we did not give more than 20 per cent in the House bill two years ago, and that is the reason the Executive has put this rate of 20 per cent reduction in the treaty which is now before us. We harm no American industry.

How was it upon tobacco? The subject of tobacco has been before the Ways and Means Committee on various occasions. We have had endless hearings, and I do not know but some of us could manufacture a cigar now because of the practical experience and teaching that we have had from these gentlemen who make cigars. We found out that they were introducing Sumatra tobacco into this country, a very thin leaf, a tough and pliable leaf, just the one for a wrapper. It suits the eye when it is put on. It is true that you can not carry a Sumatra-wrapped cigar in your vest pocket more than twenty-four minutes without its wearing out, but if you take it wrapped from the box and smoke it you will never know but that it is real tobacco with which the cigar is wrapped. That leaf wraps a great many millions of the cigars that are annually wrapped in this country.

It has this peculiar feature about it: One pound of this leaf will wrap as many cigars as nearly 4 pounds of any other leaf grown in any other country, Cuba or the United States, and so 1 pound is worth almost as much as 4 pounds of any other tobacco for wrapper purposes. We had to meet that in order to protect the tobacco interests of the United States and the tobacco-growing interests of the United States which give life and prosperity to so many farms and farmers in the United States. It became necessary to put a higher duty on wrapper tobacco. We placed it at \$2 a pound in the McKinley bill, if I remember rightly, but it was fixed at \$1.85 as the bill was finally passed under the Dingley Act—\$1.85 a pound—a good deal more than 100 per cent on the value of the article. Yes, I think it got up into the 200 per cent region. We had to put it there on account of the Sumatra tobacco.



At the same time it appeared to us that we could get along with a much lower rate of duty if we had not anything to contend against except the Cuban leaf. That was as heavy as our own; pound per pound it would wrap about the same number of cigars, and there was no reason in the world why we should put this high rate of duty on the Cuban leaf except this, that we must deal equally with all nations and put the same rates of duty on all goods coming into this country, whether they came from the German islands or from the island of Cuba, or wherever they came from. We could not favor one nation more than another. We could not favor one tobacco leaf more than another; and so we put on a duty sufficient to protect our people against the Sumatra leaf; but it was a great deal more than was necessary to protect them against the Cuban leaf, and when we come to cut off this 20 per cent of that duty on tobacco imported from Cuba, it does not even then reduce it to the same degree of competition in our market with our tobacco as would the Sumatra leaf with this rate of \$1.85. It harms no American industry.

Now, I have received two or three letters myself, and then somebody has gone to the expense of printing a petition head addressed to myself as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to be signed by cigar makers throughout the United States, protesting against this reduction of duty on cigars. These circulars evidently have been widely circulated throughout the United States. The first one came to me some three or four weeks ago, and yet there is so little interest on the part of the cigar makers of the United States that I have not received a dozen petitions from the whole country upon this subject, showing that they do not believe what is stated in the petition, that it will injure the cigar industry in the United States.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. The duty on Cuban leaf tobacco, now 35 cents, is to be reduced 7 cents, leaving a duty of 28 cents. Will the gentleman tell us whether the reduction upon manufactured cigars is the equivalent of that 7 cents a pound, or, as is claimed in the letter you received, is it much greater?

Mr. PAYNE. If the relation of the duty on tobacco to the duty on cigars is the correct relation between the two to-day, then the reduction of 20 per cent on each would have a similar effect. But I want to go a little further than that. I understand that we import into the United States less than one-eighth of 1 per cent of all the cigars that are consumed here. We make more than 99 per cent of all the cigars that are consumed here in the United States. That is a pretty high protection! Why, it is equivalent to 104 per cent. It is a mixed duty, specific and ad valorem, equal to about 104 per cent. Well, take off 20 per cent of that, and you still have 85 per cent equivalent duty left upon cigars. That ought to take care of the industry.

But let us go a little further than that. I received a letter this morning from an officer of an association stating that the reduction of 20 per cent duty on cigars made a reduction of \$12.60 upon a thousand cigars. Well, that would leave a duty of \$50 on a thousand cigars, and the cost of making a thousand cigars is from \$12 to \$18 for the labor. Now, it seems to me these people, the few of them—and they are very few—who have been induced to sign these petitions, are unduly sensitive. The truth of it is that it does not harm or threaten their industry. It does not make a single penny's difference with the prospect of this industry to cut off this high rate of duty, which is put there because of the competition of the tobacco leaf coming from Sumatra and not that coming from Cuba.

So it must be pretty evident, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in this legislation or in this treaty that will harm any industry in the United States.

Will we get any benefit from it? It is a reciprocal agreement. It is not quite as good an agreement as I put in my bill two years ago. We got a little better terms, or would have had, if that bill had become a law and they had made a treaty in accordance with it. And yet I do not know but it is more just to our sister nation to take this bill than it would have been to enforce mine. There was one provision of my bill that I liked very well, and that was that they should adopt our labor laws and Chinese-exclusion laws; but in looking over the statistics of the people who have immigrated into Cuba I have noticed that the number of Chinese cuts no figure. I do not remember the exact number of them now, but I think it is about fifty in a year. It cuts no figure whatever, and I am reconciled to the opinion that I was overzealous in putting that clause into the bill which I had the honor to report from the committee two years ago. There is no danger of an inundation from Asia into Cuba to supply cheap labor there, and if it comes, under the duty that remains after this treaty becomes effective, there is ample protection for the industries of the United States.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Right there on that point it may be well to keep the record straight. I call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that not a single new sugar industry has been planted in the State of Michigan or in the State of California since this agitation for lower sugar duties began.

Mr. PAYNE. I think that is so, Mr. Chairman, and though I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, and my prophecies do not always come true, yet when they do I like to call attention to the fact. I said to the gentleman and others two years ago that if they did not pass that bill that was then pending and stop the agitation upon the subject, so long as it was agitated in this country no new beet-sugar industry would be established here.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Does the gentleman think that new sugar industries will be started if this bill becomes a law?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman wants to make my speech for me. I was coming to that in the next sentence or two. I stated, on the contrary, and it was my opinion then, if we took that bill as I introduced it, providing for an unlimited time the 20 per cent reduction, fixing the future so that there should be no further thought of a reduction of the duty upon sugar, so that men would know what they might be expected to meet, that the people interested in this industry would go forward with their means and establish new factories; and during the debate, in confirmation of what I had said, there came to me a letter from the State of Michigan stating that they desired us to go ahead and pass that legislation and have certainty, because they could stand a reduction of 20 or 25 per cent—I think those were the figures—and it was better to have the thing settled on that basis than to have it agitated throughout the years that were to come; that they would not build until the uncertainty was over.

No, I did not expect there would be any establishment of new beet industries while this question was being agitated. Let it be settled, so that men can calculate what they will have to do. These same parties procured in this treaty a pledge that the duty upon sugar should not be lowered below this 20 per cent reduction for five years in order to give stability to their interests and their industries. Let this be enacted into law, make it certain, then I believe, without being a prophet, as suggested by the gentleman, that we will see new sugar factories established in all the States where it is profitable to have beet-sugar industries in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the argument was made two years ago—I indulged in it and it was used by others—that there had been distress, financial distress, in Cuba, based upon the reports which came to us; distress of the sugar planters; distress that would come to the laborers. It has not measured up to all that distress. There are various reports about it.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I am glad of it.

Mr. PAYNE. I am glad of it, too. But this so-called prosperity is not to be measured by the American character of prosperity. Six or seven thousand of these laborers have been employed in building a railroad, which was built by United States capital.

They imported the material with which to build that road from the United States, and United States capital paid the duty upon it and helped out their treasury. And then there is another thing about the distress down there. These laborers down there do not suffer distress in the same way as do the laborers here. In the first place, their necessities are not so great. Our laborers can not live through a northern winter without work unless they have lodging, heat, and food, even if supplied by soup houses. But in that tropical climate they can live outdoors every night. They can live on bananas and oranges, if necessary, and can live without any particular amount of distress when you measure it by the character of distress of the people of this country, whose needs are greater and who are educated up to greater wants and necessities—necessities, too, that come from our climate, etc.

Still, they are not so wondrously prosperous down there as we measure prosperity. They did have a devastating war, which reduced their population from 20 to 25 per cent, destroyed their sugar houses, and destroyed many of their industries. They have had to build them up with borrowed capital. You take the exports and imports of the two years 1894 and 1895. The exports for those two years were \$215,000,000. The imports for the two years were \$162,000,000, a balance of trade in Cuba's favor of \$52,862,000. You take the last four years, 1899 to 1902, inclusive. The total exports for the four years were \$232,000,000 and imports \$275,000,000, a balance against Cuba of \$42,700,000. Well, that does not show an alarming degree of prosperity during the last four years as we measure prosperity. In the last year I see that there was a balance of five or six million dollars in favor of Cuba.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. And they increased their output of raw sugar from 635,856 tons in 1900 to 1,130,000 tons this year.

Mr. PAYNE. It comes up to about the amount they had under the reciprocity of the McKinley bill. It is about the same as they had then—from 1891 to 1894—during the time of that reciprocity treaty. But when the provisions of that treaty were wiped out by the Wilson bill the sugar industry was destroyed, and it ran



down to 635,000. Now it is estimated for the present year the crop will be from 975,000 tons to 1,100,000 tons, which is the biggest estimate I have seen.

But the 975,000 tons is the estimate of Willett & Gray, and they surely are the best authority in this country upon that subject. There is the lower estimate, but it exceeds a million tons during two of the years from 1891 to 1894, as I recall the figures at this moment. So, while they have increased the sugar output during the war they have not yet got it back to the output of sugar when we had the reciprocity treaties under the McKinley bill. I do not know that any question will be raised as to who will get the 20 per cent reduction on sugar. That was pretty thoroughly thrashed out two years ago, and if facts and figures can prove anything, it was demonstrated to this House that under Hawaiian free sugar, under the 85 per cent reduction to Porto Rico, and under the period of free sugar to Porto Rico the difference in price between the sugar market in Porto Rico and Hawaii and the sugar market in Hamburg, the world market, is measured by the cost of freight and the charges on the sugar until it is landed in the port of New York—no greater and no less. That shows conclusively that the people of Porto Rico and the people of Hawaii easily obtain the reduction in duties which was given to them by the American Congress. I have no desire to go over that matter again. If gentlemen have any doubt on that subject, I refer them to the speech made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG], who took his time to thoroughly investigate the matter, and demonstrated the facts as I have recounted them here.

Mr. Chairman, we are not getting the trade with Cuba that we had under the reciprocal arrangement from 1891 to 1894. We do not sell her the goods we sold then. We have not almost the monopoly of her market that we had then, notwithstanding her close connection with Spain. The tariff has been equal since these treaties under the McKinley law were wiped out by the Wilson bill with other parts of the world, and we have had for the last few years about 42 per cent of the trade with Cuba—that is, we have sent her about 42 per cent of her imports. It would seem to me that under this treaty our nearness to Cuba, the increasing facilities for transportation between the United States and Cuba growing every year, we ought to sell to Cuba about all she needs. We will under this bill sell her about all she can consume.

I was told in Florida last spring that it was proposed to run a ferry from Miami, Fla., over to Habana with loaded freight cars to connect with the railroads over there, so that they could land cars from Habana in Chicago and New York. Now, that was the proposition of a man who has money and who has the courage of his convictions, a man who is building up railroad transportation. That would give us closer connection with Cuba—an almost hourly connection in the future—a chance to carry freight back and forth without the inevitable high charges for loading it on a vessel from the cars in Habana and then loading it from a vessel to the cars when it gets to the United States, or when we send goods over there it would save the high charges of loading from the cars onto the vessel in Florida and then unloading again in Cuba. We are bound to have our trade relations closer if we treat Cuba fairly, justly, and generously, and at the same time we shall have a discriminating duty in our favor, as we do under this treaty, of anywhere from 20 to 40 per cent reduction over any other nation on earth.

There are a good many things we can sell there which we do not sell now. Of wines and liquors there were imported into Cuba in three and a half years \$10,000,000, of which we only sold \$1,800,000. Well, they charge a pretty good duty upon whisky—nearly a dollar a gallon. This bill takes out 25 per cent of it. They have a large duty on wine, and this bill takes off from 20 to 25 per cent on that. Why, the country knows that we can manufacture all the whisky and all the wine that is necessary to drown the island of Cuba. [Laughter.] Why not go ahead and capture that market of \$10,000,000 in three years?

We got fifteen millions out of twenty-one millions of metal manufactured, and this bill gives us 20 per cent advantage. It looks as though we would get that other six millions when we make this reduction. There was imported \$1,617,000 worth of cheese into Cuba, of which the Netherlands contributed 63 per cent, or \$1,260,000, the United States 18 per cent, the United Kingdom 11 per cent, and Spain, I think, 8 per cent.

Well, now, there is quite a considerable duty on cheese—\$5 per hundred kilograms, about 2 cents a pound. This bill takes about 40 per cent off of that, leaving it about 1 cent and 2 mills per pound. It seems to me that we would have a "corner" on the cheese market in Cuba under this bill.

Here are boots and shoes, of which 20 per cent is imported from the United States. There can be no trouble about shoeing the people of Cuba with this reduction of 30 per cent.

A MEMBER. Have you the figures for flour and grain?

Mr. PAYNE. We have a good deal of the flour and grain busi-

ness now. That is the reason I was not speaking of it. I do not put my eye at this moment upon the figures.

Here is the item of soap: Of \$757,000 for soap, about 92 per cent came from Spain; only 5½ per cent from the United States. While we use more soap per capita than all the nations on the face of the globe, because our people are so cleanly they could not be without it—while we are making so much of this article, we can furnish the whole supply to the people of Cuba instead of having them try to wash themselves on the poor article which comes to them from Spain. On soap this bill makes a reduction of 30 to 40 per cent—40 per cent on the higher grades of soap.

For candles the expenditure was \$516,000, of which 87.2 per cent came from Spain, the United States furnishing only 3 per cent. We furnish those people all their vegetable oil, and we ought to furnish the candles, too. The duty has been \$5 per hundred kilograms, about 2 cents a pound. This bill makes a reduction of 20 per cent upon candles.

We do not get all the trade in salted meats. Upon hams, shoulders, and salt pork we get \$2,888,000 out of \$3,233,000. But I believe in our going for that other 23 per cent that we do not now get.

Of the expenditure for lard, we get 99.8 per cent now; I do not care who gets that other two-tenths of 1 per cent. So I might go on through the list. But I want to call attention to the trade under the reciprocity agreement of 1891 and 1894. Bacon and hams paid, in 1900, a duty of \$6.25 per 100 kilograms (that is, 220 pounds), and there was exported from Cuba to the United States that year \$550,000 worth. In 1893, when we were under the McKinley reciprocity agreement and the free list, the amount exported was \$1,317,000, two and one-half times as much. In 1896, after the termination of the treaty and when the duty was again between six and seven dollars, the exports fell to \$734,000. In 1901, with a duty of only \$4 per 100 kilograms, the exports rose again to \$1,017,000. Now, we shall get all that trade. The export of lard from this country to Cuba in 1890, at \$7.30 per 100 kilograms, amounted to \$2,233,821. In 1893, under the McKinley treaty, it was \$4,023,917. In 1896 it fell again to one million and a half dollars. In 1901, when the duty was \$2.80, it ran up to \$2,811,696. In 1890 flour exports amounted to \$1,164,538, the duty being \$4.69 per 100 kilograms. In 1893, with a duty of \$1 per 100 kilograms, the amount was \$2,821,557. In 1896, with a duty of \$4.75, the amount was \$647,057. In 1901, the duty being again \$1, the imports into the United States amounted to \$2,018,129. That answers the inquiry of the gentleman in regard to flour.

The case will be found to be similar in regard to exports of corn and other breadstuffs from this country to Cuba. In 1893 the amount more than doubled as compared with 1890 and 1896. That was under McKinley reciprocity. When that was wiped out the amount fell. Under this bill we shall take control of the market for these commodities.

In dairy products the results are similar—these articles being free in 1893, but in 1890 and 1896 paying a duty of \$6.25 to \$15 per 100 kilograms. So I might go on through the list. But I have only sought, by referring to a few of these items, to show the possibility of enlarging our trade with Cuba. In dealing with this question we are not to confine ourselves to a consideration of what Cuba is able to buy now, after four or five years of war, when her people are poor, when her laborers are sleeping out at night, and in the daytime eating bananas to sustain life.

Sir, let Cuba become prosperous, with closer trade relations with the United States, making the conditions down there stable for five years or as much longer as this treaty shall remain in force. Let American capital go down there to develop the island and employ the islanders. Let there be a demand for better things and more of them. Multiply the buying capacity of the people as we have multiplied it in the last five years in the United States under the Dingley tariff law, so that the people want more, buy more, and are ready to give bigger prices because they get larger wages. Under such improved conditions what shall be the future of our imports into Cuba? Shall the amount be barely \$60,000,000, as during the past year, for all imports, running up to \$100,000,000 in the days preceding the war; or shall it be what Colonel Bliss, of the United States Army, a careful and impartial observer, says in his report on Cuba—\$300,000,000 a year bought from the United States to supply the needs and the capacities of the people down there?

Why, there are millions in this bill to the farmers and manufacturers of the United States. It is not a one-sided affair, it is a reciprocal tariff; it is a reciprocal convention, a convention that we are called upon to make—a real convention—by act of the House of Representatives and of the Congress of the United States.

I do not know that I can do better than quote from Mr. Bliss, for he puts it a great deal better than I can:

But the above-mentioned trade represents a period of the gravest commercial and agricultural oppression. Cuba had suffered a devastation such



as has rarely accompanied war even in far less civilized times. Her population had been diminished by from 20 to 25 per cent. Her plantations had been burned, and worst of all a large part of her sugar mills, upon which the industry of the island almost wholly rests, had been completely ruined. Perhaps equally serious in its retarding effect was the lack of confidence due to the uncertain tenure of the government of intervention and the character of the government that would succeed it—a feeling which checked the investment of capital both for the development of new industries and the rehabilitation of existing ones more or less ruined.

Therefore the trade of the island since January 1, 1899, has been little more than trade in the absolute necessities of life. It is not too much to anticipate that with the full return of prosperity Cuba's annual trade, inward and outward, would amount to \$300,000,000, or more than \$1,000,000,000 during a period equal to that covered by the late government of intervention.

One needs only to state the figures to make every American feel that there is something wrong, something that should be at once remedied, in the conditions that place so large a part of this great trade, great even under the present conditions, and to be far greater in the near future, in the control of other nations than our own.

Mr. Chairman, our national pride appeals to us to pass this bill. Why should we allow the nations from across the seas to come here, right to Cuba, within 80 miles of the United States, and take her trade in articles that we could furnish? Let us branch out, and when we have conquered the Cuban trade let our merchants go a little farther down into the South American States and follow up the vantage ground we have gained, and when the numberless ships that shall traverse the ocean from the United States to Cuba under the American flag find it a little dull, let them go down as far as Brazil—yes, take in the whole of South America—and pick up the trade that our people are willing and anxious to furnish the material for and give further employment to our people and our artisans and our capital. Why, the spirit of pride, American pride, is in this bill and in this enterprise toward the island of Cuba. These reasons, Mr. Chairman, appeal to us: Aid to Cuba, no injury to the industries of the United States, trade with Cuba, closer relations with Cuba, and, above all, meeting out that sympathy due from us, the guardian, to her, the ward, whom we have turned out to seek a living among the nations of the earth, doing everything that we can and sending to her the full measure of generosity, so that she may be an example to the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend now to make any speech upon the pending bill. I shall reserve the right to close the debate for this side of the Chamber. Some few things, however, spoken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], have struck me as being somewhat novel from his standpoint, and to them I shall perhaps direct a few innocuous observations. The gentleman from New York has made that speech so often—that part of it which defends protectionism—that he has gotten so that he makes it very well indeed. [Laughter.] As to that part of his speech which advocates this bill upon its merits, it is almost as sudden a conversion as was that of St. Paul, while he was yet Saul of Tarsus, on his way to Damascus; it was almost as sudden an occurrence as was this recent birth of the new Republic of Panama, “shoved up from behind.” [Laughter.] Those are the only two things that I know of in the world that compare with it.

The gentleman has said something, however, that I wish to deny, that the Democrats wanted to put this amendment upon this bill for the purpose of killing the treaty. They do not want to do anything of that sort. They never did kill the treaty. During the Fifty-seventh Congress we took the liberty of robbing the sugar trust of part of its power to rob the American consumer and to tyrannize over American commerce and the American sugar planter—in as far as we could rob them of that power—by removing the differential. We said then, in effect, to the Republican party, “Here is your bill, bettered, improved, amended; a good bill in itself, but with this better feature upon it, and it is ‘up to’ your Senate and it is ‘up to’ your President to say whether they will surrender their pet measure—the pet measure of this Administration—or let it die a-borning somewhere rather than hurt their friend, the great American sugar trust.” We gave you that choice. You took your choice deliberately. This bill would have been law to-day, this treaty would have been in force to-day, if you had not loved the sugar trust more than you did reciprocal relations with Cuba. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So much for that. Now, the gentleman makes a strange admission from his standpoint. He says that he wants to benefit Cuba. How? By having Cuba reduce her protective tariff 20, 25, 30, 35, and 40 per cent. That is a sort of thing that I can understand, but the thing that I can not understand is how the gentleman from New York understands it, with all of his record behind him as a protectionist. The gentleman says that this treaty is not without precedent, and I am glad to agree with him there. I remember well some precedent for it. First, the great reciprocity treaty with Frederick the Great, who was then the tyrant of Prussia. I remember the next, with Spain. I remember the third, with France; and I remember that the hand that had more to do with molding them than any other one hand in this world was that of the father of Democracy himself, Thomas Jefferson. [Ap-

plause on the Democratic side.] I remember that the greatest and most beneficial reciprocity treaty that this country ever had was the reciprocity treaty negotiated with Canada in 1854 by a Democratic Administration and repealed under a Republican Administration in 1866 or 1867. I remember that General Grant, in 1874, sent to a Republican Senate another reciprocity treaty with Canada, simply a furtherance of that of 1854, and that died a-borning, not because it would not have been beneficial to the general interest of American citizens, but because it was thought detrimental, in their opinion, to some of the selfish, legislatively housed industries of the United States.

There are precedents. Let us have more of them. Let us go marching on in the pathway of commercial friendship, turning our backs upon commercial war; and when we cast our eyes northward across an imaginary boundary between ourselves and a people who are homogeneous in blood, in tradition, in aspiration, in law, and in literature, let us build up friendly relations with them by friendly reciprocal trade.

I now say, representing, as I believe, Democracy all over this country, that we will welcome the initiative taken by the President of the United States—if he will take it—in reconvening the Joint High Commission, in order that we may have a condition of commercial amity instead of threatened commercial war with the great Dominion of Canada. So much, my friends, for that.

Let us anticipate Chamberlain's attempt to have the Dominion differentiate against us in favor of Great Britain.

My friend says that this will take five or six million dollars out of the Treasury, and he thinks that would be an advantage, and there again I accord with him. It seems to me that the very best way of letting the people make money is to let the people keep their money; and after you are through with all of your political talk upon all of the hustings of the United States, upon that side and upon this, the fact remains that every dollar in the public till came from somewhere. It was not poured down like manna from the sky. It did not come as a free gift. Government is not an independent entity to get things from nowhere and from nobody. Every dollar in the Treasury came from some American citizen somewhere. I welcome the fact that we will have that many millions less in the Treasury and that we will have that many millions more in the pockets of the people, in the channels of commerce, where it is needed to give life and blood to the industrialism of the country. [Applause.]

My friends, I said I intended to make no speech now. I did not. I intended to rise for the purpose mainly of reading the minority report upon this bill, so that it may be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It expresses almost exactly what I think, and what I believe a majority of you, my fellow-Democrats in the House, think. Before reading that report, however, I wish to read, in conclusion of my remarks, something appearing in this morning's New York Times, an independent newspaper:

#### LIGHT AT LAST.

We congratulate the country on the attitude of the Democrats in the House of Representatives, formally adopted and declared in caucus, as to Cuban reciprocity. It is manly, intelligent, and patriotic, and it gives substantial encouragement to the hope that we shall have a national opposition party with which sensible men can work.

The Democrats have determined to treat the reciprocity treaty solely with reference to the general question of freer trade. They will seek to amend the bill proposed by the Republicans by repealing the odious preferential on refined sugar given to the sugar trust, and, further, by striking out the provision that seeks to bind Congress not to make any further reduction in duties for five years. The former amendment is directed against an outrageous piece of corrupt favoritism, and the latter against a silly attempt, which, nevertheless, might make an unfortunate precedent, to hinder the freedom of Congressional action. When these two amendments are lost, as, of course they will be under the iron rule of the Republican managers, the Democrats will support the bill as a step toward freer trade, at first with Cuba, and later with the rest of the world.

The minority report is as follows:

We, minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, make the following report of our views concerning H. R. 1921, being a bill entitled “A bill to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902,” introduced in the House of Representatives on the 12th day of November, 1903, by Mr. PAYNE, of New York, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

We believe that the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means ought to have been amended in committee before being reported and ought now to be amended in the House before its passage, as follows:

By striking out the following language, beginning in line 15, page 2, and ending in line 2, page 3—

And then follows the language that we want stricken out, the language which attempts to bind us—because it can not really bind—but attempts to bind and pledge succeeding Congresses and succeeding treaty-making powers against an alteration of certain tariff schedules upon sugar from Cuba and sugar from other countries, and inserting instead thereof the identical resolution which passed the House last year, which was put on there by us upon this side of the Chamber, for the purpose of bettering the bill, although it is perhaps true that if that had been the sole estimated effect of the amendment we would not have had the aid from your side to give us the power to pass it. There were votes cast for it, of course,



because it was thought that if you stopped the differential to the sugar trust the bill would be killed. But that was not my object and that was not the object of the Democrats upon this floor.

That language is:

"Provided, That while said convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon, as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897; and no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897," and by inserting the following in lieu thereof:

"That upon the making of said agreement and the issuance of said proclamation and while said agreement shall remain in force there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in lieu of the duties thereon now provided by law, on all sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color, and all sugar which has gone through a process of refining imported into the United States, 1.825 cents per pound."

Now, my friends—

Our objection to the language proposed to be stricken out is twofold. First, as a general principle one Congress has no right to attempt to bind a succeeding Congress, as is attempted in this bill in the case of sugars imported from Cuba, nor to attempt to bind the treaty-making power of the United States in a succeeding Congress or under a succeeding Administration, as is attempted in the bill in the case of sugars imported from other foreign countries. We do not believe that the language proposed to be stricken out is or could be made of binding force, even if enacted into law. It is, ostensibly, at any rate, a waiver, to some extent, of the general right of abrogation and establishes a precedent of evil import.

In the second place, we are not willing to bind ourselves nor silently to acquiesce in an attempt, although legally and morally ineffectual, to bind us to continue in existence at a given fixed rate a duty upon any product imported into the United States for any definite period, whether the article be sugar or anything else, or whether it be the product of the island of Cuba or of any other country or of all other countries.

Public needs and interests may at any moment suggest or require a different treatment of tariff schedules. A schedule is not a fetish to be worshipped. We hope that the House will strike out the provision.

We think, in the next place, that there ought to be inserted in lieu of the provision proposed to be stricken out, or elsewhere in the bill, the language proposed to be inserted by the amendment above referred to, because, in our opinion, we would thereby deprive the great sugar trust of this country of some of its power to extort from the consumer, curtail its power to bear down the price of the raw material, thereby injuring the sugar planter, and lessen its ability to dictate to wholesale and retail dealers in sugar the manner in which they shall do business and the price at which they shall sell refined sugar.

The House during the Fifty-seventh Congress took this view and passed an amendment identically worded as now proposed by us. The House took that view after a full investigation and a comparatively full discussion of the question, and the very treaty proposed to be put in force by the bill (H. R. 1821) would have been in force now had all those charged with the duty of legislation in other branches of the Government been willing to see the burden upon the American consumer of sugars and other products imported from Cuba into the United States lightened or had they been willing to see the Cuban market for American products enlarged at some expense, even, to the great sugar trust of the United States. The only injury to the trust, even, would have been to lessen to a small degree its power to extort from the consumer and to tyrannize over producers and commerce.

If the amendment which we propose to offer shall be adopted, we shall gladly vote for the bill, believing that it will, at one and the same time, diminish to a certain extent the trust evil, furnish a better and wider and further market for American agricultural and manufactured products in Cuba, and benefit the American consumer of Cuban products. These are three consummations devoutly to be wished.

If the amendment shall not be adopted, we still recommend the passage of the bill, despite its bad features, because we think that the good to be done by its passage will far overbalance the evil which will result from a failure to take advantage of the opportunity to diminish the power of the sugar trust and the evil resulting from the bad precedent proposing, ineffectually it is true, to prevent the country from still further reducing duties upon Cuban sugars and upon sugars from other countries whenever it shall appear wise and expedient to do so by reciprocal treaty agreement or by statute law.

Believing, as we do, that commerce ought to be as nearly untrammelled as possible consistently with the needs of a revenue for economical and effective governmental administration, and consistently with a desire not to revolutionize existing conditions by destroying honest, legitimate, and nonmonopolistic enterprises, we find in this bill an affirmation of that principle, a step in the right direction, and furthermore a recognition of the fact that a decrease of governmental tolls levied upon international commerce constitutes a benefit to the countries between which the commerce is carried on.

Charged with the duty of legislating for the benefit of the American people, as we are, and friends to the new-born Republic of Cuba, desiring her prosperity, we recognize that this bill will, to some extent, relieve the unnecessary burdens upon both Americans and Cubans, enabling the Americans to buy Cuban products at more reasonable prices, and enabling the Cubans to buy American products at more reasonable prices, thereby enlarging the volume of trade between the two countries in both directions.

We regret that the party in power has not seen its way to confer still further benefits upon the citizens of both nations by providing for even freer and yet more untrammelled and unrestricted commerce between them. As long as the present party is in power we can perhaps hope for tariff reductions and revision only from reciprocity treaties. It is a piecemeal process, but it is better than no process at all. We hail it as a harbinger of future reciprocity treaties with other countries, especially those upon the American Continent, and notably our neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada.

Commercial wars are detrimental, sometimes destructive. They are wars in which there can not be a victor on either side—wars as a result of which both sides endure defeat. Friendly relations between peoples can not be as certainly secured in any other way as by the reciprocal benefits of trade and commerce. Men of different nations bound to one another by large and valuable trade relations are bound by the closest tie of a materialistic character known to human nature—the tie of self-interest. They have given a mutual bond to keep the peace and strenuous "jingoism" itself hesitates under such circumstances to disturb it.

We recommend the passage of the amendment referred to above, and failing in that, having fled our protest by voice and by vote, against the right of power to bind our future conduct, we still recommend the passage of the bill.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to read that because I wanted it to go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks, and for no other purpose, and thus get it quickly to the country.

I now yield forty minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

[Mr. SWANSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. One minute. Does the gentleman from New York desire to occupy more time now, or will the gentleman from Mississippi occupy more of his time?

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman prefers to go on, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is prepared to proceed and is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Very well.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, not desiring to abuse the patience of the House or unnecessarily consume its time, I request unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, with the printing of tables also.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and that extension will include certain tables. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. His remarks to be confined to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. With the understanding that he confine his remarks to the bill under consideration. Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Well, I will ask the gentleman to define how wide the range of that request might be, if granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York hear the observation of the gentleman?

Mr. PAYNE. I did not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. How wide the range might be.

Mr. PAYNE. Just the range I stated in my language.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the gentleman will leave that to me I will try to conform to my ideas of what is meant. [Laughter.] I hope the gentleman will not put a limitation on my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again state the request of the gentleman from Indiana; that is, that he be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD, with the publication of certain tables as a part of his remarks. Is there objection to that request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine my observations to one feature of this pending measure, but it will involve, as it seems to me, the entire subject of over tariff taxation. I recognize that in this country we have a Government ruled by party, and that certain discipline is necessary to accomplish the best results under that system. I believe that it is the sentiment of a majority in this House that the Committee of Ways and Means, under this rule, have taken a course more drastic than is justified by the situation of the country. We have a rule presented that denies to the membership of this House the right to amend a proposition by an amendment that seeks to reach one of the greatest evils involved in a system that collects revenue in excess of the needs of Government. But it seems we must submit on this side to that with only criticism to answer it.

We find growing up in the Republican party a new system of alignment, which I am willing to characterize as the "stand-patters" in the first degree and the "stand-patters" of the second degree. The new word has been coined by the Republicans to meet the peculiar condition. I believe that the majority of the Republican voters in this country are in favor of a reduction of taxation, and that that sentiment if truly expressed is reflected in the membership of this House on the Republican side; but by reason of the dominating spirit of the "stand-patters in the first degree," by their insidious, mysterious influence, they are able, under the rules of this House and the modes of procedure, to have "stand-patters in the second degree" succumb to their will, and, submerging their individual views, the latter permit the former to present a measure in the House that will deny the individual power of Members and disfranchise their constituents on a vital question before the country.

For the proposition to which I shall address myself I will take as a text the Treasury report of the Secretary of the Treasury dated the 14th day of November, 1903, showing an available cash balance in the United States Treasury of \$223,000,000, of which sum \$158,000,000 is in national-bank depositories that pay no interest upon it, but loan it to the people at the usual per cent. Whence came this money and where is it to-day? This money has been received from the people of this country by your system of taxation, and under that system evils have arisen that are criticised by Members of that side of the House. But they are held in restraint. They privately admit, but on the signal they rush within the lines. Would we ever have heard of a grant of



\$3,000,000 to the Philippine Islands last session as a pure gratuity out of our Treasury had we not had this enormous surplus, built up from taxation?

Would we ever have heard of the extravagant appropriations of the Fifty-seventh Congress, which out-Heroded anything that has been known before? To-day we find the Secretary of the Treasury, and we have in years gone by found him refunding and purchasing United States bonds increased in price by the knowledge of the bondholders that the Secretary offers to purchase them, and last year millions of dollars were paid out as excess price for United States Government bonds out of the surplus you have built up. Repeatedly he has paid millions in interest before it was due. Further, the Secretary of the Treasury has resorted to the if not illegal expedient, at least the improper expedient of permitting the deposit of State and municipal bonds for the securing of deposits in the national-bank depositories of the country. It seems he would add railroad bonds to this favored class of security. Yet with this money, \$158,000,000, taken by taxation from the people unjustly, we as representatives are denied the privilege and the opportunity of reducing national taxation, which our constituencies and yours demand, to the end that taxation should be no more than is needed for government honestly administered. The Secretary of the Treasury, in order to get the money among the people, sends it to the national banks of the country, and is clothed with this tremendous and dangerous power without a protest from the Republican side.

Its practice confesses an unjust use of the taxing power, for without an unnecessary accumulation there would be no transfer of the money to the banks. When is this money to be loaned to the banks and when withdrawn? In good times or in times of panic? Will the Government be able at all times to withdraw it with ease? Would it not be especially difficult to withdraw it in panicky times?

To the bankers of what section will it first go? To those sections where stock gambling and where dealing in options and margins may affect local conditions, or will it go to the West for the movement of crops?

The answers to these queries will show the extreme danger that inheres in the policy.

Such a discretion is lodged in the Secretary of the Treasury that he is made a Napoleon of finance and a Czar over our money.

An officer should not have such a power, or be subject to the influences that surrounds the exercise of it. Those who submerge patriotism to greed would encourage excessive taxation to accumulate a surplus to get the pelf.

The decisions to be made under such a power are too momentous to the people, too fraught with consequences to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the right to make them.

These are the burdens upon the American people to-day. They find millions of their taxation as a surplus for what? Would you have heard of the widespread post-office scandals in this country had you not a great surplus accumulated? Would you have heard of the Indian land scandals if you had not encouraged it by a riot of extravagance, the fruit of an excess? Would you have heard of the stealing of millions of acres of public domain out West had you not set the pace by building up a surplus in the Treasury? Why, sir, for months we had the mooted purchase of the Danish West Indies before us. This was invited by the surplus. During thirty years they have been on the bargain counter. The overflowing Treasury furnished an opportune time to try to press them upon us.

Mr. Chairman, when we passed the Cuban war-tax bill we authorized the issue of two hundred millions of bonds to carry on the Cuban war, with the promise from the leaders of this House, with the promise of the gentleman from New York, with the promise of the two gentlemen who have gone to the Senate, with the promise of the honorable Speaker of this House, that as soon as the war was over the war taxes would be repealed. But, sir, for three months the war waged, and then it closed. But for four long years the war taxes were kept on until this surplus was erected mountain high as a feast for the cormorants who have less patriotism and regard for the country than good citizens should have.

Now, the Secretary of the Treasury would have us take the municipal bonds, which represent the debts of the people; the State bonds, that represent the debts of the people, bearing an interest higher usually than the Government bonds—take those bonds as a safe security for the deposit of the people's money wrung from them by taxation when that money should be left in their hands to use as they please and to pay the State and municipal bonds. We get this policy because the "stand-patters" of the first degree with power and influence, not in numerical strength in the House or the country, but by superior domination, are able to conquer the rising spirit of the gentlemen who voted before for the killing of the sugar trust.

Now, with all the evils that come from clothing the Secretary of the Treasury with the power to get out this money, what may

follow in its train? I make no aspersions on any officer, but that is a power that should not be lodged in any one man. When will he give out the money, in what amounts, and to what locality will he send it? To what States and to what cities shall it go, and what amount will he send to each State, each city, each depository? When will the Secretary of the Treasury withdraw it—when the Government needs it? From what locality will it come—from what State, city, depository? These are matters that are presented, and bring us back to 1837, when the United States, with a surplus of \$28,000,000, granted it to the treasurers of the respective States, and it stands to-day unpaid to the United States Government as one of the unavailable assets on its books.

The Chicago Tribune gives us some history:

By the year 1835 the original debt of the nation had been wiped out and a surplus had begun accumulating. At the beginning of 1837 the balance in the Treasury, after deducting a reserve fund of \$5,000,000, was \$37,468,000. By act of Congress this money was divided pro rata among the treasurers of the twenty-six States and was to be repaid on demand. These deposits were to be made in four installments, and three of them were paid, aggregating \$28,000,000.

The curious part of it is that the transaction remains to-day in the same incomplete condition. The States never have refunded this money. The State treasurers of Arkansas and Virginia have tried to compel the National Treasury to pay the fourth installment. \* \* \* This money still appears among the "unavailable funds" in every report of the Treasurer of the United States.

Here you have one hundred and fifty-eight millions. Is it not a prey to political influence? Is it not an incentive to corruption? Is it not surely an incentive to extravagant appropriations? And for the answer to that I refer to the honorable Speaker of this House in his statement last session, and the statement of many other distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the House. Where is this one hundred and fifty-eight millions? It is in New York—some of it. New York has a population of 7,000,000, one-eleventh of the population of the country, and yet, when it comes to depositing in banks our money without interest, New York gets over a quarter of all our surplus moneys in the national-bank depositories. These national-bank depositories have one hundred and fifty-eight millions of the people's money, unjustly drawn from them by taxation, which the "stand-patters" insist shall not be removed. Of the one hundred and fifty-eight millions the State of New York has \$42,724,000.

No wonder we have "stand-patters" in the country when such bounty is given to special favorites.

Pennsylvania, with a population of 6,000,000, has her fourteen millions. Illinois, with a population of 4,000,000, has six millions in money. Ohio, well favored, has her five millions. Missouri, on account, I presume, of the special arrangement in respect to the exposition, has her six millions.

I make no criticism of the national banks of this country on their attitude in this matter, and scarcely a criticism can be made of those who, under the power of law sanctioned by an Administration party, take advantage of the means that are offered them to enrich themselves—what I maintain is that the people suffer.

Texas, with a population of 3,000,000, has one million nine hundred thousand of these assets. Massachusetts, well favored, with a population of less than that of Texas, has ten millions of these assets. Indiana, with a population of two millions and a half, has one million two hundred and seventy-seven thousand. Iowa, who furnishes many distinguished public men, with a population of 2,000,000, has three millions four hundred thousand of this money, all without a cent of interest—these one hundred and fifty-eight millions of money, collected by you unjustly, while you refuse to take from the burdens of the people, go to these different banks, with its usufruct, without a cent of interest. Georgia has one million of this money. Kentucky, always a State that fights strenuous political battles, has a population of 2,000,000, and has five millions of these deposits to loan to the people. Wisconsin, with a population of 2,000,000, has two millions of funds of the Government. Maryland has three million three hundred and forty-two thousand of these United States funds, with but a million of population. Nebraska, where the political battle wages warm, with a population of 1,000,000, has one million three hundred and forty-seven thousand in money.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes; but the gentleman will recognize that my time is brief, and I would like him to get my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to yield me time in which to answer the question.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think the gentleman will. I think he will give the gentleman time to answer the question. Does the gentleman object to the fact that the public moneys are kept in the banks, or does he object to the particular banks in which they are kept?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will tell the gentleman my views.



I object here to the raising of money for the purpose of placing it in the Treasury as a surplus, with the train of evils that I have mentioned and which compels the placing of it in the national banks, and on which money of the people they pay no interest.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman answer my question? Of course nobody favors raising money for the sake of putting it in the banks, but with the money already raised, with it secured, with it taken by taxation, what would he do with it—put it in the banks or lock it up in the Treasury?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It is perfectly secure with the bonds of the United States.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Would he lock it up in the Treasury or put it in the banks?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman asks me if I object to the particular banks. I would rather say not, with some exceptions; and now, Mr. Chairman, I will try to show the evils that are likely to arise when a large surplus is here and the banks want to get the money.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman kindly answer the question, or does he not desire to answer it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have tried to treat the gentleman and his question courteously.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. What I would like to know is what would he do with the money after it was raised—put it in the banks or lock it up in the Treasury?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would not lock it up in the Treasury. With the rates of national taxation we could not have money to pay if this sum was locked up in the Treasury.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Then the gentleman would refuse to put it in the banks?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would destroy the surplus by reducing taxation. The question then would not arise in reference to deposits. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is taking my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Now, as to whether I object to some of the banks, I read from a document of the House and I would like the gentleman from Connecticut to listen:

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK.  
New York, June 5, 1897.

MY DEAR MR. GAGE: The National City Bank of this city, of which I recently became vice-president through the consolidation of the business of the Third National with it, is one of the banks designated as a United States depository, and I write to request that any changes which may be made under the Administration we may not be disturbed in this respect.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked me to listen.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield, and the gentleman from Connecticut is not in order.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. But the gentleman asked me to listen.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It is true, I did ask the gentleman to listen. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield now?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman says he will listen.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Not until I finish this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield. The Chair was correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will continue the reading of the letter:

We should like to remain a United States depository as at present. Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

[Laughter and applause.]

Now, this fund, built up as a surplus by excessive taxation, will be made the goal of men less patriotic than good American citizens ought to be. In another letter [reading]:

If not presuming too much, we would be greatly obliged for a suggestion from you as to the amount of bonds which it would be good judgment for us to acquire at the present time, this move on our part being quite as much in the public interest (in the prevention of any money stringency) as it is in our own interest as bankers.

It is apparent that the amount of money received by the Treasury from the sale of this property will considerably exceed the amount of currency sixes maturing on January 1 next, and it is in the hope that a considerable portion of these funds will be left with the banks for a sufficient length of time to afford a reasonable profit that we undertake the expense of procuring the necessary bonds to qualify us as a depository.

Yours, very truly,

A. B. HEPBURN,  
Vice-President.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,  
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

This letter asks the advice of the Secretary of the Treasury as to what he shall do, showing by his familiarity of expression

that the Secretary of the Treasury would not possibly be offended by that consultation of the Standard Oil bank's vice-president.

Now the gentleman asks me, "Do you object to these banks having the money?" Mr. Chairman, I said that in some respects I might. Now let me give these cities. As an appendix to my remarks I will include every national bank in this country by name, and the city of its location, with the amount that it has as a United States Government depository. And when I come to New York and the gentleman asks me if I have any objection to any particular bank having the money, I simply suggest to him that there is one bank that I think has a little more than it ought to have, and he will think so when I tell him that this bank, about which Mr. Hepburn wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury, out of the total \$158,000,000 has \$12,930,700 of the people's money, wrung from them by taxation, that it is loaning out to the people at interest, in order to give the people the power to pay this excessive taxation that you have forced upon them, and that the stand-patters decline to take off.

Now, is it possible that with this money in the United States Treasury they would not make use of it to some extent for political ends? Hepburn thought so when he spoke of political influence his bank had in the campaign. I have known smaller matters than that, Mr. Chairman, to have that result. When rural free delivery came up I thought that I stood pretty well with the powers that be, and in the first circular that was issued they gave my indorsement of a petition that went as information to the Members of the House and to the Senate; but later on, when they attempted to prostitute this splendid service to partisan ends, I found this letter in answer to one I wrote to a distinguished member of the Administration:

MY DEAR MR. ROBINSON: I have your favor of the — instant with reference to petition for rural free delivery starting from —. I have forwarded the same to Hon. —, Republican candidate for Congress in the Twelfth district, for suggestions from him. He is entirely familiar with reference to applications for rural free delivery. As soon as I have heard from him I will be glad to take further action in the matter.

If a little matter of rural free delivery is made the vehicle for partisan ends, why can we not assume under the record I present to you by tables clearly showing favoritism and that this money in the United States Treasury has been used for political influence and to further the cause of the party giving it out to the banks, that the same thing will continue in the future while so vicious a policy is not corrected by a reduction of national taxation?

I will not mention the name of the gentleman from whose office this letter came. It is due to him to say that his signature was placed on the letter with a rubber stamp. No doubt he was over the country, doing the best he could to preach the gospel of high taxes, and his secretary stamped his name at the bottom of the letter. To-day, in every newspaper we pick up, statements are seen of reductions of wages; we have statements showing that the cost of living to the laboring man is 16 per cent higher now than it was several years ago, and this is a fitting time, I think, for the Republican party to break away from that influence that comes, I think, from less than a majority, to "stand pat," and follow the dictates of their own judgment and reduce this tariff tax that is building up in the Treasury this money.

The Treasury report of November 14, 1903, shows the amount of surplus as follows:

#### EXHIBIT A.

Statement of the United States Treasury on the 14th day of November, 1903—  
Cash in the Treasury.

#### GENERAL FUND.

In national bank depositories to credit of the Treasurer of the United States.....	\$158,602,286.73
Available cash balance.....	223,144,309.08

The basis for my presenting in groups the States and cities, with the amounts of deposits in national banks, is found in a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, which reads as follows:

#### EXHIBIT B.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, November 11, 1903.

Hon. J. M. ROBINSON,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith, in compliance with the request contained in your letter of the 10th instant, two lists of national banks which have been designated as depositories of public moneys, showing the names of the banks, their location, and the amount of public moneys to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, held by each. These amounts do not include any funds to the official credit of United States disbursing officers. One is a list of the permanent or regular depositories, and the other a list of the temporary or inactive depositories; both have separate columns showing the banks which hold \$1,000,000 or more, and the other less than \$1,000,000.

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW, Secretary.

The population is taken from the census of 1900, and the full list of national-bank depositories in the United States is referred



to in the letter of transmittal by the Secretary of the Treasury. I will print in full as an appendix to my remarks.

## EXHIBIT C.

## NATIONAL BANKS DESIGNATED AS TEMPORARY SPECIAL DEPOSITARIES.

Balances held to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31, 1903.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
First National Bank, Anniston, Ala.	\$50,000	
Anniston National Bank, Anniston, Ala.	50,000	
City National Bank, Selma, Ala.	200,000	
Consolidated National Bank, Tucson, Ariz.	50,000	
First National Bank, Los Angeles, Cal.	200,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Los Angeles, Cal.	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Los Angeles, Cal.	50,000	
First National Bank, Oakland, Cal.	50,000	
First National Bank, Pomona, Cal.	50,000	
First National Bank, Riverside, Cal.	110,000	
First National Bank, San Diego, Cal.	50,000	
Crocker-Woolworth National Bank, San Francisco, Cal.	100,000	
San Francisco National Bank, San Francisco, Cal.	300,000	
Western National Bank, San Francisco, Cal.	150,000	
First National Bank, San Jose, Cal.	50,000	
First National Bank, Cripple Creek, Colo.	100,000	
National Bank of Commerce, Denver, Colo.	100,000	
First National Bank, Fort Collins, Colo.	50,000	
Carbonite National Bank, Leadville, Colo.	100,000	
Mercantile National Bank, Pueblo, Colo.	50,000	
Bridgeport National Bank, Bridgeport, Conn.	102,500	
First National Bank, Hartford, Conn.	100,000	
Etina National Bank, Hartford, Conn.	51,900	
First National Bank, Meriden, Conn.	400,000	
Home National Bank, Meriden, Conn.	100,000	
Mechanics' National Bank, New Britain, Conn.	100,000	
National Bank of Norwalk, Norwalk, Conn.	240,000	
First National Bank, Norwich, Conn.	75,000	
Pawcatuck National Bank, Pawcatuck, Conn.	50,000	
Windham National Bank, Willimantic, Conn.	50,000	
American National Bank, Washington, D. C.	100,000	
National Metropolitan Bank, Washington, D. C.	240,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Washington, D. C.	50,000	
Riggs National Bank, Washington, D. C.		\$3,000,000
First National Bank, Fernandina, Fla.	50,000	
First National Bank, St. Augustine, Fla.	50,000	
Atlantic National Bank, Jacksonville, Fla.	100,000	
Third National Bank, Atlanta, Ga.	200,000	
Fourth National Bank, Atlanta, Ga.	354,000	
Georgia National Bank, Athens, Ga.	50,000	
Third National Bank, Columbus, Ga.	150,000	
National Bank of Columbus, Columbus, Ga.	50,000	
First National Bank, Macon, Ga.	50,000	
American National Bank, Macon, Ga.	90,000	
First National Bank, Marietta, Ga.	50,000	
First National Bank, Pocatello, Idaho	50,000	
First National Bank, Wallace, Idaho	50,000	
First National Bank, Amboy, Ill.	50,000	
First National Bank, Beardstown, Ill.	50,000	
Old National Bank, Centralia, Ill.	80,000	
First National Bank, Champaign, Ill.	50,000	
Hamilton National Bank, Chicago, Ill.	200,000	
National Bank of the Republic, Chicago, Ill.	100,000	
Second National Bank, Danville, Ill.	120,000	
Danville National Bank, Danville, Ill.	100,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Decatur, Ill.	100,000	
National Bank of Decatur, Decatur, Ill.	100,000	
First National Bank, East St. Louis, Ill.	100,000	
First National Bank, Edwardsville, Ill.	50,000	
Home National Bank, Elgin, Ill.	50,000	
Joliet National Bank, Joliet, Ill.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Bedford, Ind.	50,000	
First National Bank, Brazil, Ind.	50,000	
First National Bank, Crawfordsville, Ind.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Crawfordsville, Ind.	100,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Evansville, Ind.	50,000	
City National Bank, Evansville, Ind.	50,000	
Hamilton National Bank, Fort Wayne, Ind.	300,000	
First National Bank, Frankfort, Ind.	50,000	
Franklin National Bank, Franklin, Ind.	50,000	
Central National Bank, Greencastle, Ind.	50,000	
Third National Bank, Greensburg, Ind.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Greensburg, Ind.	50,000	
Columbia National Bank, Indianapolis, Ind.	50,000	
Fletcher National Bank, Indianapolis, Ind.	500,000	
Union National Bank, Indianapolis, Ind.	100,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Kokomo, Ind.	50,000	
Howard National Bank, Kokomo, Ind.	50,000	
City National Bank, Lafayette, Ind.	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Lafayette, Ind.	154,625	
National Fowler Bank, Lafayette, Ind.	50,000	
First National Bank, Lebanon, Ind.	50,000	
Lebanon National Bank, Lebanon, Ind.	50,000	
Union County National Bank, Liberty, Ind.	50,000	
First National Bank, Madison, Ind.	100,000	
National Branch Bank, Madison, Ind.	100,000	
Delaware County National Bank, Muncie, Ind.	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Muncie, Ind.	100,000	
Second National Bank, New Albany, Ind.	50,000	
New Albany National Bank, New Albany, Ind.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Peru, Ind.	53,000	
People's National Bank, Princeton, Ind.	50,000	
First National Bank, Richmond, Ind.	50,000	
South Bend National Bank, South Bend, Ind.	50,000	
National Bank of Sullivan, Sullivan, Ind.	50,000	
Second National Bank, Vincennes, Ind.	50,000	
First National Bank, Key West, Fla.	50,000	
Fort Dallas National Bank, Miami, Fla.	50,000	
Exchange National Bank, Tampa, Fla.	50,000	
City National Bank, Kankakee, Ill.	50,000	

Balances held to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31, 1903—Continued.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
Pana National Bank, Pana, Ill.	\$50,000	
Edgar County National Bank, Paris, Ill.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Princeton, Ill.	50,000	
Manufacturers' National Bank, Rockford, Ill.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Belle Plaine, Iowa	50,000	
First National Bank, Boone, Iowa	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Burlington, Iowa	80,000	
National State Bank, Burlington, Iowa	100,000	
Cedar Falls National Bank, Cedar Falls, Iowa	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Cedar Falls, Iowa	51,000	
Cedar Rapids National Bank, Cedar Rapids, Iowa	87,500	
First National Bank, Chariton, Iowa	50,000	
City National Bank, Clinton, Iowa	50,000	
National Bank of Decorah, Decorah, Iowa	50,000	
Des Moines National Bank, Des Moines, Iowa	100,000	
Valley National Bank, Des Moines, Iowa	100,000	
First National Bank, Garner, Iowa	50,000	
First National Bank, Mason City, Iowa	100,000	
City National Bank, Mason City, Iowa	100,700	
First National Bank, Montezuma, Iowa	51,000	
First National Bank, Mount Pleasant, Iowa	100,000	
National State Bank, Mount Pleasant, Iowa	55,000	
Oskaloosa National Bank, Oskaloosa, Iowa	50,000	
Iowa National Bank, Ottumwa, Iowa	50,000	
Ottumwa National Bank, Ottumwa, Iowa	50,000	
First National Bank, Red Oak, Iowa	100,000	
Red Oak National Bank, Red Oak, Iowa	233,000	
First National Bank, Rock Valley, Iowa	50,000	
First National Bank, Shenandoah, Iowa	50,000	
Shenandoah National Bank, Shenandoah, Iowa	50,000	
Iowa State National Bank, Sioux City, Iowa	50,000	
First National Bank, Waterloo, Iowa	50,000	
Black Hawk National Bank, Waterloo, Iowa	50,000	
Commercial National Bank, Waterloo, Iowa	52,700	
Leavitt & Johnson National Bank, Waterloo, Iowa	50,000	
Abilene National Bank, Abilene, Kans.	50,000	
First National Bank, Anthony, Kans.	50,000	
Exchange National Bank, Atchison, Kans.	50,000	
First National Bank, Fort Scott, Kans.	50,000	
Galena National Bank, Galena, Kans.	50,000	
First National Bank, Hutchinson, Kans.	50,000	
Commercial National Bank, Independence, Kans.	50,000	
Commercial National Bank, Kansas City, Kans.	50,000	
First National Bank, Kingman, Kans.	50,000	
Manufacturers' National Bank, Leavenworth, Kans.	85,000	
First National Bank, Manhattan, Kans.	100,000	
First National Bank, Ottawa, Kans.	50,000	
First National Bank, Pittsburg, Kans.	50,000	
Farmers' National Bank, Salina, Kans.	50,000	
National Bank of America, Salina, Kans.	50,000	
Central National Bank, Topeka, Kans.	100,000	
Fourth National Bank, Wichita, Kans.	50,000	
Kansas National Bank, Wichita, Kans.	100,000	
National Bank of Commerce, Wichita, Kans.	50,000	
First National Bank, Winfield, Kans.	50,000	
Second National Bank, Ashland, Ky.	50,000	
Ashland National Bank, Ashland, Ky.	100,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Ashland, Ky.	50,000	
Catlettsburg National Bank, Catlettsburg, Ky.	50,000	
Hardin National Bank, Elizabethtown, Ky.	50,000	
Trigg National Bank, Glasgow, Ky.	50,000	
Henderson National Bank, Henderson, Ky.	200,000	
Second National Bank, Lexington, Ky.	80,000	
Payette National Bank, Lexington, Ky.	50,000	
Farmers' National Bank, Princeton, Ky.	50,000	
First National Bank, Somerset, Ky.	50,000	
First National Bank, Crowley, La.	50,000	
Calcasieu National Bank, Lake Charles, La.	50,000	
Lake Charles National Bank, Lake Charles, La.	50,000	
New Iberia National Bank, New Iberia, La.	50,000	
State National Bank, New Orleans, La.	100,000	
First National Bank, Shreveport, La.	50,000	
First National Bank, Augusta, Me.	100,000	
Northern National Bank, Hallowell, Me.	50,000	
Canal National Bank, Portland, Me.	60,000	
Ticonic National Bank, Waterville, Me.	50,000	
First National Bank, Baltimore, Md.	150,000	
Third National Bank, Baltimore, Md.	60,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Baltimore, Md.	50,000	
National Bank of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md.	100,000	
National Bank of Commerce, Baltimore, Md.	264,000	
National Marine Bank, Baltimore, Md.	50,000	
National Union Bank of Maryland, Baltimore, Md.	100,000	
First National Bank, Catonsville, Md.	50,000	
Easton National Bank of Maryland, Easton, Md.	200,000	
Farmers and Mechanics' National Bank, Frederick, Md.	50,000	
First National Bank, Frostburg, Md.	153,615	
First National Bank, Oakland, Md.	50,000	
National Bank of Rising Sun, Rising Sun, Md.	134,000	
Salisbury National Bank, Salisbury, Md.	50,000	
Greylock National Bank, Adams, Mass.	75,000	
Second National Bank, Boston, Mass.		
Fourth National Bank, Boston, Mass.	100,000	
American National Bank, Boston, Mass.	200,000	
Atlantic National Bank, Boston, Mass.	50,000	
Mount Vernon National Bank, Boston, Mass.	100,000	
National Bank of Redemption, Boston, Mass.	905,000	
National Bank of the Republic, Boston, Mass.	350,000	
People's National Bank of Roxbury, Boston, Mass.	100,000	
South End National Bank, Boston, Mass.	100,000	
State National Bank, Boston, Mass.	240,000	
Winthrop National Bank, Boston, Mass.	150,000	
Grundy County National Bank, Grundy Center, Iowa	50,000	
Knoxville National Bank, Knoxville, Iowa	50,000	
Marion County National Bank, Knoxville, Iowa	50,000	
First National Bank, Waverly, Iowa	50,000	
First National Bank, Horton, Kans.	50,000	



Balances held to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31  
1903—Continued.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
People's National Bank, Ottawa, Kans.	\$50,000	
Winfield National Bank, Winfield, Kans.	50,000	
First National Bank, Fall River, Mass.	50,000	
Massasoit-Pocasset National Bank, Fall River, Mass.	77,000	
Westminster National Bank, Gardner, Mass.	43,700	
City National Bank, Gloucester, Mass.	430,200	
Haverhill National Bank, Haverhill, Mass.	253,000	
Hingham National Bank, Hingham, Mass.	100,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Lawrence, Mass.	100,000	
Lee National Bank, Lee, Mass.	50,000	
Traders' National Bank, Lowell, Mass.	250,000	
First National Bank, Lynn, Mass.	100,000	
Central National Bank, Lynn, Mass.	25,000	
First National Bank, Marlboro, Mass.	150,000	
People's National Bank, Marlboro, Mass.	100,000	
Natick National Bank, Natick, Mass.	100,000	
Merchants' National Bank, New Bedford, Mass.	220,000	
Adams National Bank, North Adams, Mass.	230,000	
Berkshire National Bank, North Adams, Mass.	100,000	
First National Bank, Northampton, Mass.	82,000	
Northampton National Bank, Northampton, Mass.	50,000	
Agricultural National Bank, Pittsfield, Mass.	200,000	
Old Colony National Bank, Plymouth, Mass.	100,000	
First National Bank, Reading, Mass.	50,000	
Asiatic National Bank, Salem, Mass.	100,000	
Mercantile National Bank, Salem, Mass.	100,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Salem, Mass.	50,000	
Spencer National Bank, Spencer, Mass.	100,000	
Second National Bank, Springfield, Mass.	100,000	
Chapin National Bank, Springfield, Mass.	200,000	
City National Bank, Springfield, Mass.	100,000	
John Hancock National Bank, Springfield, Mass.	50,000	
Springfield National Bank, Springfield, Mass.	200,000	
First National Bank, West Newton, Mass.	81,000	
Mechanics' National Bank, Worcester, Mass.	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Charlotte, Mich.	50,000	
First National Bank, Iron Mountain, Mich.	50,000	
Hackley National Bank, Muskegon, Mich.	50,000	
First National Exchange Bank, Port Huron, Mich.	50,000	
Commercial National Bank, Saginaw, Mich.	50,000	
Union City National Bank, Union City, Mich.	50,000	
First National Bank, Austin, Minn.	50,000	
First National Bank, Benson, Minn.	50,000	
Northwestern National Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.	230,000	
Northfield National Bank, Northfield, Minn.	50,000	
First National Bank, Owatonna, Minn.	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, St. Paul, Minn.	400,000	
St. Paul National Bank, St. Paul, Minn.	272,000	
First National Bank, Spring Valley, Minn.	50,000	
First National Bank, Stillwater, Minn.	50,000	
First National Bank, Winona, Minn.	200,000	
Second National Bank, Winona, Minn.	50,000	
First National Bank, Gulfport, Miss.	50,000	
First National Bank, Hattiesburg, Miss.	50,000	
National Bank of Commerce, Hattiesburg, Miss.	50,000	
First National Bank, Laurel, Miss.	50,000	
First National Bank, Meridian, Miss.	50,000	
First National Bank, Yazoo City, Miss.	50,000	
Hannibal National Bank, Hannibal, Mo.	50,000	
Joplin National Bank, Joplin, Mo.	150,000	
City National Bank, Kansas City, Mo.	50,000	
New England National Bank, Kansas City, Mo.	289,000	
Union National Bank, Kansas City, Mo.	100,000	
Baird National Bank, Kirksville, Mo.	50,000	
National Bank of Kirksville, Kirksville, Mo.	50,000	
Tootle Lemon National Bank, St. Joseph, Mo.	50,000	
Third National Bank, St. Louis, Mo.		\$1,000,000
Fourth National Bank, St. Louis, Mo.	750,250	
Mechanics' National Bank, St. Louis, Mo.	500,000	
Union National Bank, Springfield, Mo.	100,000	
Trenton National Bank, Trenton, Mo.	50,000	
People's National Bank, Warrensburg, Mo.	50,000	
First National Bank, Butte, Mont.	100,000	
National Bank of Ashland, Ashland, Nebr.	50,000	
First National Bank, Beatrice, Nebr.	100,000	
Farmers and Merchants' National Bank, Fremont, Nebr.	50,000	
First National Bank, Hastings, Nebr.	50,000	
City National Bank, Lincoln, Nebr.	50,000	
Nebraska City National Bank, Nebraska City, Nebr.	50,000	
First National Bank, North Platte, Nebr.	50,000	
First National Bank, York, Nebr.	50,000	
City National Bank, York, Nebr.	50,000	
National State Capital Bank, Concord, N. H.	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Dover, N. H.	50,000	
First National Bank, Hillsboro Bridge, N. H.	50,000	
Cheshire National Bank, Keene, N. H.	50,000	
Keene National Bank, Keene, N. H.	125,800	
First National Bank, Manchester, N. H.	100,000	
Second National Bank, Manchester, N. H.	50,000	
Amoskeag National Bank, Manchester, N. H.	153,000	
Manchester National Bank, Manchester, N. H.	100,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Manchester, N. H.	50,000	
Souhegan National Bank, Milford, N. H.	50,000	
Second National Bank, Nashua, N. H.	150,000	
First National Bank, Somersworth, N. H.	100,000	
Somersworth National Bank, Somersworth, N. H.	50,000	
First National Bank, Petoskey, Mich.	50,000	
First National Bank, Albert Lea, Minn.	50,000	
City National Bank, Duluth, Minn.	100,000	
National Farmers' Bank, Owatonna, Minn.	50,000	
Third National Bank, Sedalia, Mo.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Sedalia, Mo.	50,000	
Fremont National Bank, Fremont, Nebr.	50,000	
Union National Bank, Omaha, Nebr.	100,000	
South Omaha National Bank, South Omaha, Nebr.	100,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Tecumseh, Nebr.	50,000	

Balances held to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31,  
1903—Continued.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
Second National Bank, Hoboken, N. J.	\$50,000	
First National Bank, Manasquan, N. J.	50,000	
Farmers' National Bank of New Jersey, Mount Holly, N. J.	100,000	
First National Bank, Princeton, N. J.	55,000	
First National Bank, Seabright, N. J.	50,000	
Vineland National Bank, Vineland, N. J.	50,000	
First National Bank, Clayton, N. Mex.	50,000	
First National Bank, Addison, N. Y.	50,000	
Columbia National Bank, Buffalo, N. Y.	150,000	
National Bank of Cohoes, Cohoes, N. Y.	100,000	
Lake Shore National Bank, Dunkirk, N. Y.	50,000	
Glens Falls National Bank, Glens Falls, N. Y.	58,000	
Herkimer National Bank, Herkimer, N. Y.	136,250	
First National Bank, Hornellsville, N. Y.	50,000	
Ilion National Bank, Ilion, N. Y.	50,000	
National Herkimer County Bank, Little Falls, N. Y.	50,000	
First National Bank, Mount Vernon, N. Y.	100,000	
First National Bank, New York, N. Y.		\$2,678,000
Fifth National Bank, New York, N. Y.	200,000	
American Exchange National Bank, New York, N. Y.		1,053,000
Astor National Bank, New York, N. Y.	640,000	
Bank of New York National Banking Association, New York, N. Y.	200,000	
Chase National Bank, New York, N. Y.		1,830,000
Consolidated National Bank, New York, N. Y.	200,000	
Gallatin National Bank, New York, N. Y.	74,000	
Leather Manufacturers' National Bank, New York, N. Y.	50,000	
Lincoln National Bank, New York, N. Y.	250,000	
Mercantile National Bank, New York, N. Y.		1,370,000
National Bank of North America, New York, N. Y.		1,000,000
National Park Bank, New York, N. Y.		3,000,000
New York National Exchange Bank, New York, N. Y.	121,000	
United National Bank, New York, N. Y.	100,000	
State National Bank, North Tonawanda, N. Y.	50,000	
National Bank of Norwich, Norwich, N. Y.	125,000	
Exchange National Bank, Olean, N. Y.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.	200,000	
First National Bank, Ticonderoga, N. Y.	50,000	
First National Bank, Tonawanda, N. Y.	150,000	
First National Bank, Utica, N. Y.	140,000	
Oneida National Bank, Utica, N. Y.	102,000	
Utica City National Bank, Utica, N. Y.	159,000	
First National Bank, Waverly, N. Y.	100,000	
Charlotte National Bank, Charlotte, N. C.	50,000	
First National Bank, Elizabeth City, N. C.	50,000	
National Bank of High Point, High Point, N. C.	50,000	
First National Bank, Weldon, N. C.	50,000	
Atlantic National Bank, Wilmington, N. C.	173,800	
Murchison National Bank, Wilmington, N. C.	150,000	
Second National Bank, Akron, Ohio.	50,000	
National City Bank, Akron, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Athens, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Barnesville, Ohio.	250,000	
National Bank of Barnesville, Barnesville, Ohio.	300,000	
Bridgeport National Bank, Bridgeport, Ohio.	50,000	
Central National Bank, Cambridge, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Canton, Ohio.	200,000	
Fifth National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio.	225,000	
German National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio.	100,000	
Market National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio.	50,000	
National La Fayette Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio.	290,000	
First National Bank, Cleveland, Ohio.	50,000	
Bankers' National Bank, Cleveland, Ohio.	100,000	
Central National Bank, Cleveland, Ohio.	200,000	
Colonial National Bank, Cleveland, Ohio.	400,000	
Euclid Park National Bank, Cleveland, Ohio.	450,000	
State National Bank, Cleveland, Ohio.	200,000	
Union National Bank, Cleveland, Ohio.	200,000	
Commercial National Bank, Columbus, Ohio.	100,000	
New First National Bank, Columbus, Ohio.	125,000	
Citizens' National Bank, East Liverpool, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Ironton, Ohio.	50,000	
Kenton National Bank, Kenton, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Marietta, Ohio.	50,000	
Marion National Bank, Marion, Ohio.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, McConnelville, Ohio.	50,000	
Medina County National Bank, Medina, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Niles, Ohio.	50,000	
Piqua National Bank, Piqua, Ohio.	50,000	
Quaker City National Bank, Quaker City, Ohio.	50,000	
Second National Bank, Ravenna, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Exchange Bank, Sidney, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Springfield, Ohio.	50,000	
Mad River National Bank, Springfield, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, St. Clairsville, Ohio.	52,650	
National Exchange Bank, Steubenville, Ohio.	100,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Toledo, Ohio.	151,000	
Northern National Bank, Toledo, Ohio.	325,000	
Western Reserve National Bank, Warren, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Youngstown, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Zanesville, Ohio.	50,000	
Old Citizens' National Bank, Zanesville, Ohio.	350,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Elmira, N. Y.	50,000	
Fourth National Bank, Dayton, Ohio.	50,000	
First National Bank, Defiance, Ohio.	100,000	
First National Bank, Baker City, Oreg.	100,000	
First National Bank, Eugene, Oreg.	50,000	
United States National Bank, Portland, Oreg.	100,000	
German National Bank, Allegheny, Pa.	500,000	
Second National Bank, Allentown, Pa.	50,000	
Ashland National Bank, Ashland, Pa.	50,000	
Athens National Bank, Athens, Pa.	100,000	
First National Bank, Blairsville, Pa.	50,000	
Miners' National Bank, Blossburg, Pa.	100,000	
Jefferson County National Bank, Brookville, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Canton, Pa.	52,700	



Balances held to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31, 1903—Continued.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
National Bank of Catsauqua, Catsauqua, Pa.	\$80,000	
Valley National Bank, Chambersburg, Pa.	100,000	
Delaware County National Bank, Chester, Pa.	300,000	
Clearfield National Bank, Clearfield, Pa.	50,000	
County National Bank, Clearfield, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Clifton Heights, Pa.	50,000	
National Bank of Chester Valley, Coatesville, Pa.	75,000	
National Bank of Coatesville, Coatesville, Pa.	100,000	
Tradesmen's National Bank, Conshohocken, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, East Brady, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Ebensburg, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Emporium, Pa.	100,000	
First National Bank, Greenville, Pa.	75,000	
First National Bank, Hanover, Pa.	50,000	
Harrisburg National Bank, Harrisburg, Pa.	210,500	
First National Bank, Hollidaysburg, Pa.	100,000	
Union National Bank, Huntingdon, Pa.	50,000	
National Bank of Jersey Shore, Jersey Shore, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Johnstown, Pa.	150,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Johnstown, Pa.	50,000	
Farmers' National Bank, Kittanning, Pa.	100,000	
Northern National Bank, Lancaster, Pa.	200,000	
First National Bank, Lansford, Pa.	50,000	
Lebanon National Bank, Lebanon, Pa.	50,000	
People's National Bank, Lebanon, Pa.	50,000	
National Bank of Malvern, Malvern, Pa.	82,000	
Keystone National Bank, Manheim, Pa.	51,000	
First National Bank, Marietta, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, McKeesport, Pa.	100,000	
National Bank of McKeesport, McKeesport, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Mount Carmel, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Mount Joy, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Newcastle, Pa.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Newcastle, Pa.	53,000	
National Bank of Oxford, Oxford, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Perkasie, Pa.	50,000	
Eighth National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	100,000	
Farmers and Mechanics' National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	162,500	
Fourth Street National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.		\$1,458,000
Girard National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	290,000	
National Bank of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.	100,000	
Northwestern National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	100,000	
Union National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	200,000	
First National Bank, Pittsburg, Pa.	300,000	
Federal National Bank, Pittsburg, Pa.	50,000	
Merchants and Manufacturers' National Bank, Pittsburg, Pa.	300,000	
People's National Bank, Pittsburg, Pa.	750,000	
Union National Bank, Pittsburg, Pa.	503,000	
National Bank of Pottstown, Pottstown, Pa.	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Quakertown, Pa.	50,000	
Reading National Bank, Reading, Pa.	60,000	
First National Bank, Rimersburg, Pa.	50,000	
National Bank of Sayre, Sayre, Pa.	50,000	
Traders' National Bank, Scranton, Pa.	120,000	
Sellersville National Bank, Sellersville, Pa.	50,000	
National Bank of Slatington, Slatington, Pa.	50,000	
Stroudsburg National Bank, Stroudsburg, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Sunbury, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Troy, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Tyrone, Pa.	53,000	
Farmers and Merchants' National Bank, Tyrone, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Wellsboro, Pa.	200,000	
First National Bank, West Chester, Pa.	100,000	
Second National Bank, Wilkesbarre, Pa.	50,000	
West Branch National Bank, Williamsport, Pa.	150,000	
York National Bank, York, Pa.	160,000	
National Exchange Bank, Providence, R. I.	60,000	
Old National Bank, Providence, R. I.	50,000	
People's National Bank, Charleston, S. C.	81,000	
National Loan and Exchange Bank, Columbia, S. C.	50,000	
City National Bank, Greenville, S. C.	50,000	
National Bank of Greenville, Greenville, S. C.	48,000	
National Union Bank, Rockhill, S. C.	50,000	
Central National Bank, Spartanburg, S. C.	52,700	
First National Bank, Madison, S. Dak.	50,000	
First National Bank, Chattanooga, Tenn.	25,000	
First National Bank, Dyersburg, Tenn.	50,000	
City National Bank, Johnson City, Tenn.	50,000	
Unaka National Bank, Johnson City, Tenn.	50,000	
City National Bank, Knoxville, Tenn.	100,000	
Mechanics' National Bank, Knoxville, Tenn.	50,000	
National Bank of Commerce, Memphis, Tenn.	300,000	
State National Bank, Memphis, Tenn.	232,000	
Mauchunk National Bank, Mauchunk, Pa.	50,000	
First National Bank, Clarksville, Tenn.	50,000	
Amarillo National Bank, Amarillo, Tex.	50,000	
First National Bank, Beaumont, Tex.	50,000	
American National Bank, Beaumont, Tex.	50,000	
State National Bank, Denison, Tex.	50,000	
Commercial National Bank, Houston, Tex.	50,000	
Merchants' National Bank, Houston, Tex.	50,000	
First National Bank, Paris, Tex.	50,000	
City National Bank, Paris, Tex.	50,000	
First National Bank, San Angelo, Tex.	50,000	
City National Bank, San Antonio, Tex.	50,000	
Texarkana National Bank, Texarkana, Tex.	140,000	
National Bank of Barre, Barre, Vt.	50,000	
People's National Bank, Brattleboro, Vt.	100,000	
Vermont National Bank, Brattleboro, Vt.	106,500	
Lyndonville National Bank, Lyndonville, Vt.	50,000	
Montpelier National Bank, Montpelier, Vt.	275,000	
Killington National Bank, Rutland, Vt.	50,000	
First National Bank, St. Johnsbury, Vt.	100,000	
National Bank of Newbury, Wells River, Vt.	50,000	

Balances held to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31, 1903—Continued.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
National Bank of White River Junction, White River Junction, Vt.	\$50,000	
Woodstock National Bank, Woodstock, Vt.	100,000	
First National Bank, Abingdon, Va.	50,000	
Dominion National Bank, Bristol, Va.	50,000	
First National Bank, Farmville, Va.	50,000	
First National Bank, Harrisonburg, Va.	50,000	
Rockingham National Bank, Harrisonburg, Va.	50,000	
Loudoun National Bank, Leesburg, Va.	100,000	
People's National Bank, Leesburg, Va.	100,000	
First National Bank, Richmond, Va.	270,000	
National Bank of Virginia, Richmond, Va.	395,000	
Planters' National Bank, Richmond, Va.	400,000	
National Exchange Bank, Roanoke, Va.	50,000	
Augusta National Bank, Staunton, Va.	50,000	
National Valley Bank, Staunton, Va.	50,000	
Tazewell National Bank, Tazewell, Va.	50,000	
Farmers and Merchants' National Bank, Winchester, Va.	60,000	
First National Bank, Everett, Wash.	50,000	
American National Bank, Everett, Wash.	50,000	
Capital National Bank, Olympia, Wash.	50,000	
Traders' National Bank, Spokane, Wash.	250,000	
Flat Top National Bank, Bluefield, W. Va.	50,000	
Charleston National Bank, Charleston, W. Va.	200,000	
Merchants' National Bank of West Virginia, Clarksburg, W. Va.	200,000	
First National Bank, Fairmont, W. Va.	50,000	
First National Bank, New Martinsville, W. Va.	50,000	
Second National Bank, Parkersburg, W. Va.	53,000	
First National Bank, Piedmont, W. Va.	50,000	
First National Bank, Sistersville, W. Va.	102,000	
Farmers and Producers' National Bank, Sistersville, W. Va.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Appleton, Wis.	50,000	
Lumbermen's National Bank, Chippewa Falls, Wis.	50,000	
Eau Claire National Bank, Eau Claire, Wis.	50,000	
Fond du Lac National Bank, Fond du Lac, Wis.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Greenbay, Wis.	50,000	
Rock County National Bank, Janesville, Wis.	50,000	
National Bank of Merrill, Merrill, Wis.	50,000	
Marine National Bank, Milwaukee, Wis.	150,000	
Milwaukee National Bank, Milwaukee, Wis.	200,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Oconto, Wis.	50,000	
National Union Bank, Oshkosh, Wis.	50,000	
First National Bank, Stevens Point, Wis.	50,000	
National German-American Bank, Wausau, Wis.	100,000	
First National Bank of the city of Superior, West Superior, Wis.	152,700	
American National Bank, Fort Worth, Tex.	50,000	
State National Bank, Fort Worth, Tex.	50,000	
Lockwood National Bank, San Antonio, Tex.	50,000	
Citizens' National Bank, Tyler, Tex.	50,000	
Jester National Bank, Tyler, Tex.	50,000	
People's National Bank, Manassas, Va.	50,000	
Marion National Bank, Marion, Va.	50,000	
First National Bank, Newport News, Va.	50,000	
Newport News National Bank, Newport News, Va.	50,000	
First National Bank, Laramie, Wyo.	50,000	

## EXHIBIT D.

NATIONAL BANKS DESIGNATED AS REGULAR DEPOSITARIES OF PUBLIC MONEY.

Balances to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31, 1903.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
First National Bank, Birmingham, Ala.	\$30,606.59	
Alabama National Bank, Birmingham, Ala.	50,000.00	
Merchants and Planters'—Farley National Bank, Montgomery, Ala.	15,697.38	
City National Bank, Tuscaloosa, Ala.	33,243.34	
First National Bank, Juneau, Alaska.	46,741.19	
Prescott National Bank, Prescott, Ariz.	45,499.87	
Exchange National Bank, Little Rock, Ark.	53,605.46	
First National Bank, Eureka, Cal.	48,511.05	
Los Angeles National Bank, Los Angeles, Cal.		
National Bank of D. O. Mills & Co., Sacramento, Cal.	99,448.84	
First National Bank, San Francisco, Cal.	434,000.00	
American National Bank, San Francisco, Cal.	206,931.19	
Nevada National Bank, San Francisco, Cal.	400,000.00	
First National Bank, Denver, Colo.	176,235.99	
Colorado National Bank, Denver, Colo.	85,733.58	
Denver National Bank, Denver, Colo.	139,223.68	
First National Bank, Durango, Colo.	29,288.25	
First National Bank, Montrose, Colo.	48,276.32	
First National Bank, Pueblo, Colo.	247,801.34	
First National Bank, Bridgeport, Conn.	140,894.95	
Charter Oak National Bank, Hartford, Conn.	60,880.42	
Second National Bank, New Haven, Conn.	49,448.03	
National Bank of Commerce, New London, Conn.	95,410.93	
Thames National Bank, Norwich, Conn.	45,359.69	
First National Bank, Wilmington, Del.	15,467.16	
Central National Bank, Washington, D. C.	120,111.88	
National Bank of Jacksonville, Jacksonville, Fla.	127,577.84	
American National Bank, Pensacola, Fla.	20,057.65	
First National Bank, Tampa, Fla.	76,308.82	
Atlanta National Bank, Atlanta, Ga.	158,428.23	
Lowry National Bank, Atlanta, Ga.	185,334.42	
Merchants' National Bank, Savannah, Ga.	72,772.98	
First National Bank of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii <sup>b</sup>	153,490.63	

<sup>a</sup> Holdings in disbursing officer's accounts.<sup>b</sup> October 24.



Balances to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31, 1903—  
Continued.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
Boise City National Bank, Boise, Idaho	\$70,636.57	
First National Bank, Chicago, Ill.		\$1,000,000.00
Corn Exchange National Bank, Chicago, Ill.	250,339.57	
Fort Dearborn National Bank, Chicago, Ill.	250,000.00	
Millikin National Bank, Decatur, Ill.	249,194.93	
Southern Illinois National Bank, East St. Louis, Ill.	99,740.92	
Farmers' National Bank, Pekin, Ill.	200,000.00	
German-American National Bank, Pekin, Ill.	200,000.00	
First National Bank, Peoria, Ill.	285,000.00	
Commercial National Bank, Peoria, Ill.	485,000.00	
German-American National Bank, Peoria, Ill.	285,000.00	
Illinois National Bank, Peoria, Ill.	475,000.00	
Merchants' National Bank, Peoria, Ill.	300,000.00	
Peoria National Bank, Peoria, Ill.	255,568.64	
Ricker National Bank, Quincy, Ill.	125,000.00	
Rock Island National Bank, Rock Island, Ill.	4,449.54	
First National Bank, Springfield, Ill.	66,459.25	
Illinois National Bank, Springfield, Ill.	47,284.85	
State National Bank, Springfield, Ill.	98,558.49	
Old National Bank, Evansville, Ind.	50,000.00	
American National Bank, Indianapolis, Ind.		1,000,000.00
Capital National Bank, Indianapolis, Ind.	479,000.00	
Indiana National Bank, Indianapolis, Ind.	426,297.56	
Merchants' National Bank, Indianapolis, Ind.	851,074.83	
Citizens' National Bank, South Bend, Ind.	100,000.00	
Vigo County National Bank, Terre Haute, Ind.	190,800.64	
First National Bank, Vincennes, Ind.	100,000.00	
German National Bank, Vincennes, Ind.	105,000.00	
Commercial National Bank, Muskogee, Ind. T.	20,332.61	
First National Bank, Burlington, Iowa	151,422.25	
First National Bank, Council Bluffs, Iowa	196,961.98	
First National Bank, Davenport, Iowa	200,000.00	
Citizens' National Bank, Davenport, Iowa	19,726.28	
Citizens' National Bank, Des Moines, Iowa	87,193.96	
Iowa National Bank, Des Moines, Iowa	79,419.16	
Second National Bank, Dubuque, Iowa	92,300.29	
First National Bank, Ottumwa, Iowa	192,981.42	
First National Bank, Sioux City, Iowa	50,000.00	
Security National Bank, Sioux City, Iowa	20,571.45	
Lawrence National Bank, Lawrence, Kans.	47,608.63	
First National Bank, Leavenworth, Kans.	13,690.42	
Leavenworth National Bank, Leavenworth, Kans.	79,467.86	
Carrollton National Bank, Carrollton, Ky.	100,000.00	
First National Bank, Covington, Ky.	239,271.25	
Citizens' National Bank, Covington, Ky.	133,172.95	
Farmers' National Bank, Danville, Ky.	90,634.58	
State National Bank, Frankfort, Ky.	50,000.00	
Lexington City National Bank, Lexington, Ky.	199,914.20	
First National Bank, Louisville, Ky.	258,706.81	
American National Bank, Louisville, Ky.		1,500,000.00
Citizens' National Bank, Louisville, Ky.	483,652.48	
Southern National Bank, Louisville, Ky.	298,600.00	
Union National Bank, Louisville, Ky.	415,837.32	
State National Bank, Maysville, Ky.	50,000.00	
First National Bank, Owensboro, Ky.	296,892.02	
National Deposit Bank, Owensboro, Ky.	299,973.14	
New Orleans National Bank, New Orleans, La.	200,000.00	
Whitney National Bank, New Orleans, La.	313,949.20	
Granite National Bank, Augusta, Me.	66,996.26	
First National Bank, Bangor, Me.	48,986.40	
Merchants' National Bank, Portland, Me.	59,738.49	
Merchants' National Bank, Baltimore, Md.	202,000.00	
National Exchange Bank, Baltimore, Md.	854,000.00	
National Mechanics' Bank, Baltimore, Md.	641,642.04	
Second National Bank, Cumberland, Md.	183,159.99	
Merchants' National Bank, Boston, Mass.	735,000.00	
National Shawmut Bank, Boston, Mass.		3,429,977.39
Mechanics' National Bank, New Bedford, Mass.	49,322.01	
Third National Bank, Springfield, Mass.	60,000.00	
First National Bank, Detroit, Mich.	350,854.10	
Commercial National Bank, Detroit, Mich.	216,880.04	
Old Detroit National Bank, Detroit, Mich.	250,000.00	
Fourth National Bank, Grand Rapids, Mich.	433,346.87	
Miners' National Bank, Ishpeming, Mich.	49,973.73	
First National Bank, Marquette, Mich.	52,144.05	
First National Bank, Menominee, Mich.	50,000.00	
Second National Bank, Saginaw, Mich.	525,000.00	
First National Bank, Duluth, Minn.	48,732.64	
First National Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.	190,425.74	
First National Bank, St. Paul, Minn.	58,810.08	
Second National Bank, St. Paul, Minn.	23,565.20	
First National Bank, Vicksburg, Miss.	49,917.10	
First National Bank, Kansas City, Mo.	185,181.10	
American National Bank, Kansas City, Mo.	87,017.82	
National Bank of Commerce, Kansas City, Mo.	821,994.67	
First National Bank of Buchanan County, St. Joseph, Mo.	48,118.00	
National Bank of St. Joseph, St. Joseph, Mo.	131,275.55	
Merchants' Laclede National Bank, St. Louis, Mo.		1,229,900.00
National Bank of Commerce, St. Louis, Mo.		2,344,981.83
State National Bank, St. Louis, Mo.	850,250.00	
First National Bank, Great Falls, Mont.	49,818.59	
American National Bank, Helena, Mont.	72,942.77	
National Bank of Montana, Helena, Mont.	31,246.12	
First National Bank, Lincoln, Nebr.	59,629.50	
First National Bank, Omaha, Nebr.	114,221.84	
Merchants' National Bank, Omaha, Nebr.	100,000.00	
Nebraska National Bank, Omaha, Nebr.	128,820.42	
Omaha National Bank, Omaha, Nebr.	174,785.87	
United States National Bank, Omaha, Nebr.	100,000.00	
First National Bank, Concord, N. H.	196,770.48	
First National Bank, Portsmouth, N. H.	110,305.22	
New Hampshire National Bank, Portsmouth, N. H.	100,000.00	
First National Bank, Jersey City, N. J.	450,000.00	
Union National Bank, Newark, N. J.	84,197.40	
First National Bank, Paterson, N. J.	274,000.00	
Paterson National Bank, Paterson, N. J.	155,000.00	

Balances to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31, 1903—  
Continued.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
First National Bank, Trenton, N. J.	\$34,255.38	
First National Bank, Albuquerque, N. Mex.	114,478.10	
First National Bank, Santa Fe, N. Mex.	39,298.34	
National Commercial Bank, Albany, N. Y.	216,556.47	
National Exchange Bank, Albany, N. Y.	192,782.70	
First National Bank, Binghamton, N. Y.	49,878.75	
Nassau National Bank, Brooklyn, N. Y.	167,874.28	
Third National Bank, Buffalo, N. Y.	78,195.28	
Marine National Bank, Buffalo, N. Y.	200,000.00	
Second National Bank, Elmira, N. Y.	30,791.59	
Central National Bank, New York, N. Y.	903,000.00	
Hanover National Bank, New York, N. Y.		\$5,212,164.80
Liberty National Bank, New York, N. Y.	440,000.00	
National Bank of Commerce, New York, N. Y.		5,615,391.11
National Citizens' Bank, New York, N. Y.	499,878.87	
National City Bank, New York, N. Y.		12,937,000.00
New Amsterdam National Bank, New York, N. Y.	250,000.00	
Seaboard National Bank, New York, N. Y.	201,000.00	
First National Bank, Oswego, N. Y.	103,099.20	
Westchester County National Bank, Peekskill, N. Y.	200,000.00	
Plattsburg National Bank, Plattsburg, N. Y.	42,931.60	
Flour City National Bank, Rochester, N. Y.	219,180.28	
Traders' National Bank, Rochester, N. Y.	150,000.00	
Third National Bank, Syracuse, N. Y.	145,849.46	
Manufacturers' National Bank, Troy, N. Y.	115,800.11	
Second National Bank, Utica, N. Y.	97,185.14	
Blue Ridge National Bank, Asheville, N. C.	81,858.95	
Commercial National Bank, Charlotte, N. C.	95,215.84	
First National Bank, Durham, N. C.	50,000.00	
City National Bank, Greensboro, N. C.	31,016.74	
Citizens' National Bank, Raleigh, N. C.	65,244.70	
People's National Bank, Winston, N. C.	50,000.00	
First National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak.	140,879.84	
Second National Bank, Minot, N. Dak.	49,942.80	
Minot National Bank, Minot, N. Dak.	50,000.00	
First National Bank, Chillicothe, Ohio	132,156.12	
First National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio	884,254.64	
Third National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio	241,080.46	
Fourth National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio	363,662.47	
Citizens' National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio	925,000.00	
Ohio Valley National Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio	775,000.00	
Bank of Commerce, National Association, Cleveland, Ohio	121,915.01	
Deshler National Bank, Columbus, Ohio	242,641.77	
Hayden-Clinton National Bank, Columbus, Ohio	100,000.00	
Third National Bank, Dayton, Ohio	12,807.39	
Second National Bank, Hamilton, Ohio	50,000.00	
Miami Valley National Bank, Hamilton, Ohio	151,000.00	
Merchants' National Bank, Middletown, Ohio	100,000.00	
First National Bank, Toledo, Ohio	42,535.06	
Second National Bank, Toledo, Ohio	347,835.59	
Capitol National Bank, Guthrie, Okla.	61,531.36	
Western National Bank, Oklahoma City, Okla.	203,283.98	
First National Bank, Portland, Oreg.	54,199.29	
Merchants' National Bank, Portland, Oreg.	185,502.57	
First National Bank, Altoona, Pa.	79,380.00	
First National Bank, Erie, Pa.	88,752.11	
First National Bank, Harrisburg, Pa.	193,240.50	
Conestoga National Bank, Lancaster, Pa.	93,223.18	
New First National Bank, Meadville, Pa.	50,000.00	
Corn Exchange National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	50,000.00	
Merchants' National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	729,146.16	
Quaker City National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	121,776.97	
Second National Bank, Pittsburgh, Pa.	640,000.00	
Mellon National Bank, Pittsburgh, Pa.	688,009.95	
Tradesmen's National Bank, Pittsburgh, Pa.	200,877.39	
First National Bank, Reading, Pa.	200,040.00	
Third National Bank, Scranton, Pa.	459,886.93	
First National Bank, Wilkesbarre, Pa.	50,000.00	
First National Bank, York, Pa.	50,000.00	
First National Bank, Newport, R. I.	47,563.72	
First National Bank, Providence, R. I.	45,077.36	
First National Bank, Charleston, S. C.	101,898.60	
Carolina National Bank, Columbia, S. C.	45,296.90	
Aberdeen National Bank, Aberdeen, S. Dak.	29,373.82	
First National Bank, Deadwood, S. Dak.	84,523.10	
First National Bank, Huron, S. Dak.	43,159.82	
First National Bank, Rapid City, S. Dak.	35,346.79	
Minnehaha National Bank, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	22,061.76	
National Bank of Bristol, Bristol, Tenn.	48,673.60	
Chattanooga National Bank, Chattanooga, Tenn.	133,612.56	
Manufacturers' National Bank, Harriman, Tenn.	45,875.00	
East Tennessee National Bank, Knoxville, Tenn.	38,816.11	
Holston National Bank, Knoxville, Tenn.	50,000.00	
First National Bank, Memphis, Tenn.	65,121.17	
First National Bank, Nashville, Tenn.	105,102.48	
Merchants' National Bank, Nashville, Tenn.	149,691.24	
First National Bank, Tullahoma, Tenn.	49,908.67	
Austin National Bank, Austin, Tex.	138,305.22	
American National Bank, Dallas, Tex.	184,784.08	
City National Bank, Dallas, Tex.	215,375.02	
National Exchange Bank, Dallas, Tex.	200,000.00	
First National Bank, El Paso, Tex.	140,720.43	
San Antonio National Bank, San Antonio, Tex.	43,716.96	
Merchants and Planters' National Bank, Sherman, Tex.	78,589.76	
Citizens' National Bank, Waco, Tex.	35,000.00	
First National Bank, Ogden, Utah	9,802.31	
Utah National Bank, Ogden, Utah	49,542.80	
Deseret National Bank, Salt Lake City, Utah	297,122.24	
National Bank of the Republic, Salt Lake City, Utah	254,594.20	
Merchants' National Bank, Burlington, Vt.	94,124.60	
First National Bank, Alexandria, Va.	84,748.20	
First National Bank, Danville, Va.	49,900.00	
Lynchburg National Bank, Lynchburg, Va.	76,445.19	
National Bank of Commerce, Norfolk, Va.	233,610.34	



Balances to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, October 31, 1903—Continued.

Title of bank and location.	Less than \$1,000,000.	\$1,000,000 or more.
Norfolk National Bank, Norfolk, Va.	\$78,278.90	
American National Bank, Richmond, Va.	300,000.00	
Merchants' National Bank, Richmond, Va.	719,795.51	
National Bank of Commerce, Seattle, Wash.	290,130.48	
Seattle National Bank, Seattle, Wash.	159,644.24	
Washington National Bank, Seattle, Wash.	145,422.68	
Exchange National Bank, Spokane, Wash.	90,012.62	
National Bank of Commerce, Tacoma, Wash.	56,082.88	
Citizens' National Bank, Charleston, W. Va.	62,811.25	
Old National Bank, Martinsburg, W. Va.	50,000.00	
First National Bank, Parkersburg, W. Va.	148,537.76	
National Exchange Bank, Wheeling, W. Va.	260,219.18	
Ashland National Bank, Ashland, Wis.	89,946.90	
Kellogg National Bank, Greenbay, Wis.	50,000.00	
National Bank of La Crosse, La Crosse, Wis.	199,939.50	
First National Bank, Madison, Wis.	94,750.27	
First National Bank, Milwaukee, Wis.	10,767.58	
National Exchange Bank, Milwaukee, Wis.	240,188.65	
Wisconsin National Bank, Milwaukee, Wis.	249,989.82	
Old National Bank, Oshkosh, Wis.	50,000.00	
First National Bank, Cheyenne, Wyo.	17,314.32	
Stock Growers' National Bank, Cheyenne, Wyo.	13,193.79	
ADDITIONAL DEPOSITORIES.		
Treasury of the Philippine Islands, Manila, P. I. <sup>a</sup>		\$1,615,632.51
American Colonial Bank of Porto Rico, San Juan, P. R.	221,000.84	

<sup>a</sup> September 30.

The States are named in their order of population as shown by the census.

State.	Population.	October 31, 1903, United States deposits without interest.
1. New York	7,268,891	\$42,724,893
2. Pennsylvania	6,302,115	14,943,499
3. Illinois	4,821,550	6,156,641
4. Ohio	4,157,545	5,568,650
5. Missouri	3,106,665	6,894,716
6. Texas	3,048,710	1,926,491
7. Massachusetts	2,805,346	10,636,199
8. Indiana	2,516,462	4,631,796
9. Michigan	2,420,982	1,277,697
10. Iowa	2,231,853	3,415,473
11. Georgia	2,216,331	1,210,534
12. Kentucky	2,147,174	5,223,656
13. Wisconsin	2,099,042	2,028,249
14. Tennessee	2,020,616	1,628,788
15. North Carolina	1,893,810	897,133
16. New Jersey	1,883,669	1,352,452
17. Virginia	1,854,184	1,332,776
18. Alabama	1,828,697	429,546
19. Minnesota	1,759,394	1,763,532
20. Mississippi	1,551,270	349,917
21. California	1,485,053	2,300,389
22. Kansas	1,470,495	475,730
23. Louisiana	1,381,625	806,949
24. South Carolina	1,340,816	478,894
25. Arkansas	1,311,564	53,005
26. Maryland	1,188,044	3,342,416
27. Nebraska	1,066,900	1,477,455
28. West Virginia	958,800	1,321,557
29. Connecticut	908,429	\$1,661,391
30. Maine	694,496	435,720
31. Colorado	539,700	1,135,536
32. Florida	528,542	573,942
33. Washington	518,103	1,190,290
34. Rhode Island	428,556	202,640
35. Oregon	413,536	489,601
36. New Hampshire	411,588	1,535,865
37. South Dakota	401,570	264,492
38. Oklahoma	396,331	264,814
39. Indian Territory	392,090	20,332
40. Vermont	343,641	1,025,624
41. North Dakota	401,570	240,821
42. District of Columbia	278,718	3,510,111
43. Utah	276,749	611,080
44. Montana	243,329	254,006
45. New Mexico	195,310	203,776
46. Delaware	184,736	15,467
47. Idaho	161,772	170,636
48. Hawaii	<sup>a</sup> 154,001	153,490
49. Arizona	122,931	95,499
50. Wyoming	92,531	80,507
51. Alaska	63,562	46,741
52. Nevada	42,335	
Total population United States	76,303,387	
Philippine Islands <sup>b</sup>		1,615,632
Porto Rico	953,243	221,000

<sup>a</sup> October 24, 1903.

<sup>b</sup> September 30, 1903.

New York in respect to population stands about one-eleventh; but when it comes to the disbursement of the funds raised from the people her share is over one-quarter, and the other States are specially favored by this liberality with the people's money.

The cities are named in the order of their population according to the census.

City.	Population.	October 31, 1903, United States deposits without interest.
1. New York	3,437,202	\$39,032,307
2. Chicago	1,698,575	2,800,339
3. Philadelphia	1,293,697	4,975,411
4. St. Louis	575,238	6,771,381
5. Boston	560,862	6,459,977
6. Baltimore	508,957	2,471,642
7. Cleveland	381,768	1,721,915
8. Buffalo	352,387	278,195
9. San Francisco	342,732	1,590,931
10. Cincinnati	325,902	3,953,996
11. Pittsburgh	321,616	4,308,009
12. New Orleans	287,104	613,949
13. Detroit	285,704	817,234
14. Milwaukee	285,315	850,944
15. Washington, D. C.	278,718	3,510,111
16. Newark, N. J.	246,070	84,197
17. Jersey City, N. J.	206,453	450,000
18. Louisville, Ky.	204,731	2,926,795
19. Minneapolis, Minn.	202,718	290,425
20. Providence, R. I.	175,597	155,077
21. Indianapolis, Ind.	169,164	3,406,371
22. Kansas City, Mo.	163,752	1,533,192
23. St. Paul, Minn.	163,065	754,375
24. Rochester, N. Y.	162,608	369,180
25. Denver, Colo.	133,859	501,191
26. Toledo, Ohio	131,822	896,270
27. Allegheny, Pa.	129,896	500,000
28. Columbus, Ohio	125,560	567,641
29. Worcester, Mass.	118,421	50,000
30. Syracuse, N. Y.	108,374	145,849
31. New Haven, Conn.	103,027	49,448
32. Paterson, N. J.	105,171	429,000
33. Fall River, Mass.	104,863	120,000

If favoritism and influence would be charged in the distribution of this surplus, this first group of States and cities, with their large and disproportionate per cent, would certainly prove the charge.

#### GROUP 1.

State.	Population.	October 31, 1903, United States deposits without interest.
1. New York	7,268,891	\$42,724,893
2. Pennsylvania	6,302,115	14,943,499
7. Massachusetts	2,805,346	10,636,199
26. Maryland	1,188,044	3,342,416
42. District of Columbia	278,718	3,510,111

The next group shows States where political campaigns rage the fiercest and where some elements of doubt obtain.

#### GROUP 2.

State.	Population.	October 31, 1903, United States deposits without interest.
1. New York	7,268,891	\$42,724,893
7. Massachusetts	2,805,346	10,636,199
8. Indiana	2,516,462	4,631,796
12. Kentucky	2,147,174	5,223,656
21. California	1,485,053	2,300,389
26. Maryland	1,188,044	3,342,416
27. Nebraska	1,066,900	1,477,455
31. Colorado	539,700	1,135,536

The next group shows a larger number of the favored States.

#### GROUP 3.

State.	Population.	October 31, 1903, United States deposits without interest.
1. New York	7,268,891	\$42,724,893
2. Pennsylvania	6,302,115	14,943,499
3. Illinois	4,821,550	6,156,641
4. Ohio	4,157,545	5,568,650
7. Massachusetts	2,805,346	10,636,199
8. Indiana	2,516,462	4,631,796
10. Iowa	2,231,853	3,415,473
21. California	1,485,053	2,300,389
42. District of Columbia	278,718	3,510,111



The next group are large States not much favored in the distribution of the fruit of the people's burden, all safely Democratic.

## GROUP 4.

State.	Population.	October 31, 1903, United States deposits without interest.
6. Texas.....	3,048,710	\$1,928,461
11. Georgia.....	2,216,331	1,210,534
14. Tennessee.....	2,020,616	1,623,798
15. North Carolina.....	1,893,810	897,133
17. Virginia.....	1,854,184	1,332,776
18. Alabama.....	1,828,697	429,545
20. Mississippi.....	1,551,370	349,917
23. Louisiana.....	1,381,625	865,949
24. South Carolina.....	1,340,316	478,894
25. Arkansas.....	1,311,564	53,605

Group 5 shows eastern and Group 6 cities of West and South.

## GROUP 5.

City.	Population.	October 31, 1903, United States deposits without interest.
1. New York.....	3,437,202	\$39,052,307
3. Philadelphia.....	1,293,697	4,975,411
5. Boston.....	580,892	6,459,977
6. Baltimore.....	508,657	2,471,642
11. Pittsburgh.....	321,616	4,308,009
15. Washington, D. C.....	278,718	3,510,111

## GROUP 6.

2. Chicago.....	1,698,575	\$2,800,339
7. Cleveland.....	381,768	1,721,915
9. San Francisco.....	342,782	1,580,931
10. Cincinnati.....	325,902	3,953,906
12. New Orleans.....	287,104	613,949
13. Detroit.....	285,704	817,234
14. Milwaukee.....	235,815	850,944
18. Louisville.....	204,731	2,925,795
19. Minneapolis.....	202,718	380,429
21. Indianapolis.....	169,164	3,406,371
22. Kansas City.....	163,732	1,533,192

Mr. Chairman, this is the people's money, contributed by them to meet the Government's expenses, money extorted from them. As to the policy by which it has been withdrawn from the people, it rests with the gentlemen on the other side, who insist "We must stand pat." And why? You know that as soon as there is an attempt at reduction of tariff taxes the first schedules to be attacked will be the schedules that yield no revenue, but simply act as a shelter to the trusts.

You never had a better exemplification of the result of your policy than when you sent this bill to the Senate two years ago, containing a provision which would have destroyed the sugar trust. At that time the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] voted against it, and we found the Senate—the majority of the members holding his sentiments—solidly banked up against the laying of a finger upon those great aggregations that need no protection. It is because the "stand-patter," numerically less than a majority of the Republican party, but in strength and influence able to dominate it by the peculiarities of the situation, insist that there shall be no tinkering with the tariff, because they know (whatever other reasons may be assigned) such action may destroy the trusts and do away with the surplus of \$158,000,000, money which the people have paid in the form of taxation, of which the banks are to-day receiving the benefit, paying no interest to the Government, but loaning that money out to the people at the usual percentage.

Suppose that you men, who live either in cities or in counties, should find your municipal or county government collecting \$50,000 more money than it needed for the administration of its affairs; and suppose that money were taken and placed in two banks of your county, to be there loaned out to the people of that neighborhood; what a revolt there would be among your constituency. Yet \$158,000,000 is thus used by the action of this Republican House of Representatives.

I am glad that the Secretary of the Treasury has favored us with the information which shows us the condition of affairs in this respect. You may take the States and group them together, as I have done. In like manner you may take the cities by groups, and then you may draw your own inferences from population, locality, and preferences.

When you find your money going into the States where your political battles have been fought—when you find it going to localities where men high in official life are found—when you find

such to be the conditions prevailing, I say that it is time for the people to rise and stop this iniquity and stop that sort of politics. The people will have to do it. The "stand-patters" and depositaries will not. They will favor a continuance of the present line of policy.

When can you get that money back? I ask my good friend from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL]. I ask my good Massachusetts friend [Mr. MCCALL], When can you get that money back? This burden of decision should not be placed upon the Secretary of the Treasury. We do not need this large surplus. It encourages extravagance and corruption.

In the bill providing for the Cuban war tax the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to issue certificates of indebtedness up to the \$100,000,000 to meet any emergency. That is a stronger reason why we do not want to pile up a surplus in the United States Treasury. No Secretary of the Treasury would often avail himself of that authority without having Congress called together; but the power is vested in him; the provision giving the Secretary of the Treasury this power is the one vestige of the war-tax bill that is to-day unrepealed, and it is available. There is no longer any need for continuing in force this provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates of indebtedness to pay the expenses of the Government, except upon the theory of a threatened deficit.

I have thought it proper to present these considerations to the House as bearing upon the whole question of tariff taxation and surplus and show the danger, to the end that the people of this country may know where this money is and who is responsible for taking it from them and placing it practically in the hands of the banks, who get the interest as a pure donation. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PAYNE. Does any gentleman on the other side desire to go on to-night? We have no speaker ready at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then I think it would be a good idea for the House to adjourn now. If any gentleman should begin his speech now, it would be split in two by the adjournment.

Mr. PAYNE. I move, then, that the committee rise. The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, 1902, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I shall not make a speech upon the pending bill for reasons known to my Democratic associates in the House. Before those reasons became binding I had submitted a minority report from the Committee on Ways and Means, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to object, but I ask in that connection that the report be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the printing of the report also in the RECORD? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee. The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Enrolled Bills—Mr. WACHTER, Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of Illinois, Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LIVERNASH.

## RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair presents the following letter of resignation.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D. C., November 16, 1903.

HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Having tendered to the governor of the State of Texas my resignation as a Member of Congress from the Eighth district of Texas, effective after the 16th day of November, A. D. 1903, I now beg to advise you of my action, and through you the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

THOMAS H. BALL.

The SPEAKER. The letter will lie upon the table.

## RECIPROCITY WITH CUBA.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the two reports, the majority and minority reports, printed as one and in the same connection. I have already inserted the views of the minority in my remarks, and I ask that they be inserted with the other report.

Mr. PAYNE. Instead of printing your report with your remarks?



Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want it to go with my remarks.

Mr. PAYNE. That will be printing it twice; but it is not lengthy, and I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The report of the committee is as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902, having had the same under consideration, report the same back with a recommendation that the bill pass.

The enactment of this bill into law is necessary to give effect to the convention providing for reciprocal trade between this country and Cuba. This results not merely because the convention itself provides that it "shall not take effect until the same shall have been approved by the Congress," but because the Constitution gives no power to the President and the Senate to make a convention or treaty changing the rates of revenue. That power is expressly lodged in the Congress (sec. 8, Article I of the Constitution). Section 7 of the same article provides that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." It is not intended here to cite authorities or advance reasons on this proposition. The records of Congress abound with unrefuted arguments on the affirmative of this contention, and the practice of Congress has been uniformly in the same direction. The reciprocity treaties with Great Britain in reference to our trade relations with Canada and with Hawaii were, by their terms, each dependent upon the passage by the Congress of appropriate legislation reducing the duties and making provision for the carrying into effect of their terms. Every treaty requiring the payment of money, from the Jay treaty to the treaty of Paris (with Spain), has been referred to the Congress to make the necessary appropriation of money. Foreign countries in making treaties with us are bound to take notice of this requirement of our Constitution, and, whether it is expressed in the treaty or not, the whole matter is subject to the necessary legislation by the Congress.

The convention to which this bill refers is by its terms not to "take effect until the same shall have been approved by the Congress." If, in the judgment of Congress, the terms of the treaty are to become the law of the land it is necessary, both by the terms of the convention and by force of the express requirement of the Constitution, that Congress pass the requisite legislation authorizing the change in our revenue laws.

To render the convention valid it is necessary to enact into law the language of the proviso of Article VIII, "and no sugar, the product of any other foreign country, shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897." To enact these words into law would be to admit, by implication, that duties could be lowered by treaty or convention. Your committee can not consent to this proposition, nor is it believed that such an admission would be sanctioned by any Member of the House. The bill, therefore, adds the following saving clause at the conclusion of this proviso:

"And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be held or construed as an admission on the part of the House of Representatives that customs duties can be changed otherwise than by an act of Congress originating in said House."

This proviso, in the judgment of your committee, preserves the contention of the House as to its rights and prerogatives under the Constitution.

Legislation upon this subject was very properly initiated in the House at the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress. A bill was introduced early in the session "to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba." That bill authorized the President to make a commercial agreement with Cuba, in most of its essentials identical with this convention now proposed. That bill was reported by this committee March 31, 1902, and finally passed the House with amendments April 19, 1902. The bill failed in the Senate, but the Executive took up the negotiations which have resulted in this convention, which was ratified by the Senate in March last.

This subject was first brought to the attention of Congress by the President in his message at the beginning of the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress. He said:

"Elsewhere I have discussed the question of reciprocity. In the case of Cuba, however, there are weighty reasons of morality and of national interest why the policy should be held to have a peculiar application, and I most earnestly ask your attention to the wisdom—indeed, to the vital need—of providing for a substantial reduction in the tariff duties on Cuban imports into the United States. Cuba has in her constitution affirmed what we desired—that she should stand, in international matters, in closer and more friendly relations with us than with any other power; and we are bound by every consideration of honor and expediency to pass commercial measures in the interest of her material well-being."

These words were reinforced by the Secretary of War in his report, as follows:

"Aside from the moral obligation to which we committed ourselves when we drove Spain out of Cuba, and aside from the ordinary considerations of commercial advantage involved in a reciprocity treaty, there are the weightiest reasons of American public policy pointing in the same direction; for the peace of Cuba is necessary to the peace of the United States; the health of Cuba is necessary to the health of the United States; the independence of Cuba is necessary to the safety of the United States. The same considerations which led to the war with Spain now require that a commercial arrangement be made under which Cuba can live. The condition of the sugar and tobacco industries in Cuba is already such that the earliest possible action by Congress upon this subject is desirable."

The President has deemed the subject of sufficient importance to convene an extraordinary session of Congress in order that the convention may become effective before the commencement of the harvest of the new sugar crop in December. In his message to the present Congress he forcibly states his reasons for the passage of this legislation:

"The treaty submitted to you for approval secures to the United States economic advantages as great as those given to Cuba. Not an American interest is sacrificed. By the treaty a large Cuban market is secured to our producers. It is a market which lies at our doors, which is already large, which is capable of great expansion, and which is especially important to the development of our export trade. It would be indeed shortsighted for us to refuse to take advantage of such an opportunity, and to force Cuba into making arrangements with other countries to our disadvantage."

"This reciprocity treaty stands by itself. It is demanded on considerations of broad national policy as well as by our economic interest. It will do harm to no industry. It will benefit many industries. It is in the interest of our people as a whole, both because of its importance from the broad standpoint of international policy and because economically it intimately concerns us to develop and secure the rich Cuban market for our farmers, artisans, merchants, and manufacturers. Finally, it is desirable as a guar-

anty of the good faith of our nation toward her young sister Republic to the south, whose welfare must ever be closely bound with ours. We gave her liberty. We are knit to her by the memories of the blood and the courage of our soldiers who fought for her in war; by the memories of the wisdom and integrity of our administrators who served her in peace and who started her so well on the difficult path of self-government. We must help her onward and upward; and in helping her we shall help ourselves."

"The foregoing considerations caused the negotiation of the treaty with Cuba and its ratification by the Senate. They now with equal force support the legislation by the Congress which by the terms of the treaty is necessary to render it operative. A failure to enact such legislation would come perilously near a repudiation of the pledged faith of the nation."

This legislation will result in no harm to any American industry. Articles the product of this country like the articles embraced in this convention now imported from Cuba receive the very highest protection of any in the same schedule. The duty on sugar was placed above the protective point for the purpose of revenue. The House tariff bill provided expressly for a reduction in the interests of reciprocal trade agreement, which it authorized the President to make. The duty on tobacco has for years been much higher than any necessity required on account of the competition of Cuban tobacco. The reduction in this bill leaves it amply protected. The present rate was intended primarily for protection against the Sumatra leaf, 1 pound of which, for wrapper purposes, will go nearly as far as 4 pounds of any other tobacco. The reduction of duty in this bill will injure no American industry.

On the other hand, we can but make great gains in our export trade to Cuba. On account of the depression caused by the low price of sugar, although six or seven thousand men were employed in railroad building and there were large importations of railroad material and equipment during the year, Cuban imports have fallen off from an average of more than \$90,000,000 in the preceding three years to about \$80,000,000 in 1902. Of these imports we furnished less than 42 per cent. We should furnish at least 80 per cent. Under the preferential tariff rate provided in the convention we ought in a short time to supply practically the Cuban market. We produce everything she needs and buys. We shall have an advantage of from 25 to 40 per cent discount on tariff rates on articles with which we do not now supply her people. This legislation will certainly tend to bring prosperity to Cuba, and our imports must increase and our market broaden. Our trade will advance from year to year, as it did under the former period of reciprocal agreement (1891-1894) inaugurated under the McKinley Act. This legislation will bring rich results both to Cuba and to the United States, and will fittingly complete one of the proudest chapters in our history, which chronicles the sacrifices of a great nation for an oppressed and distressed people at our very door.

The views of the minority are as follows:

We, the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, make the following report of our views concerning H. R. 1921, being a bill entitled "A bill to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902," introduced in the House of Representatives on the 12th day of November, 1902, by Mr. PAYNE, of New York, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

We believe that the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House ought to have been amended in committee before being reported and ought now to be amended in the House before its passage, as follows:

By striking from the bill the following language, beginning in line 15, page 2, and ending in line 2, page 3:

"Provided, That while said convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon, as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, and no sugar, the product of any other foreign country, shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States, while this convention is in force, at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897."

And by inserting the following in lieu thereof:

"That upon the making of said agreement and the issuance of said proclamation and while said agreement shall remain in force there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in lieu of the duties thereon now provided by law on all sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color and all sugar which has gone through a process of refining imported into the United States, 1.825 cents per pound."

Our objection to the language proposed to be stricken out is twofold:

First, as a general principle, one Congress has no right to attempt to bind a succeeding Congress, as is attempted in this bill in the case of sugars imported from Cuba, nor to attempt to bind the treaty-making power of the United States in a succeeding Congress or under a succeeding Administration, as is attempted in the bill in the case of sugars imported from other foreign countries. We do not believe that the language proposed to be stricken out is, or could be made, of binding force and effect, even if enacted into law. It is, ostensibly, at any rate, a waiver, to some extent, of the general right of abrogation and establishes a precedent of evil import.

In the second place, we are not willing to bind ourselves nor silently to acquiesce in an attempt—although legally and morally ineffectual to bind us—to continue in existence, at a given fixed rate, a duty upon any product imported into the United States for any definite period, whether the article be sugar or anything else, or whether it be the product of the island of Cuba, or of any other country, or of all other countries.

Public needs and interests may at any moment suggest or require a different treatment of tariff schedules. A schedule is not a fetich to be worshipped. We hope, therefore, the House will strike out the provision.

We think, in the next place, that there ought to be inserted in lieu of the provision proposed to be stricken out, or elsewhere in the bill, the language proposed to be inserted by the amendment above referred to, because, in our opinion, we would thereby deprive the great sugar trust of this country of some of its power to extort from the consumer, curtail its power to bear down the price of the raw material, thereby injuring the sugar planter, and lessen its ability to dictate to wholesale and retail dealers in sugar the manner in which they shall do business and the price at which they shall sell refined sugar.

The House during the Fifty-seventh Congress took this view and passed an amendment identically worded as now proposed by us. The House took that view after a full investigation and a comparatively full discussion of the question, and the very treaty proposed to be put in force by this bill (H. R. 1921) would have been in force now had all those charged with the duty of legislation in other branches of the Government been willing to see the burden upon the American consumer of sugars and other products imported from Cuba into the United States lightened, or had they been willing to see the Cuban market for American products enlarged, even though at some expense to the great sugar trust of the United States. The only injury to the trust itself even would have been to lessen to a small degree its power to extort from the consumer and to tyrannize over producers and commerce.



If the amendment we propose to offer shall be adopted, we shall gladly vote for the bill, believing that it will at one and the same time diminish to a certain extent the trust evil, furnish a better and wider and further market for American agricultural and manufactured products in Cuba, and benefit the American consumer of Cuban products. These are three consummations devoutly to be wished.

If the amendment shall not be adopted, we still recommend the passage of the bill despite its bad features, because we think that the good to be done by its passage will far overbalance the evil which will result from a failure to take advantage of the opportunity to diminish the power of the sugar trust and the evil resulting from the bad precedent proposing, ineffectually it is true, to prevent the country from still further reducing the duties upon Cuban sugars and upon sugars from other countries whenever it shall appear wise and expedient to do so by reciprocal treaty agreement or statute law.

Believing, as we do, that commerce ought to be as nearly untrammelled as possible, consistently with the needs of a revenue for economical and effective governmental administration, and consistently with a desire not to revolutionize existing conditions by destroying honest, legitimate, and nonmonopolistic enterprises, we find in this bill an affirmation of that principle, a step in the right direction and, furthermore, a recognition of the fact that a decrease of governmental tolls levied upon international commerce constitutes a benefit to the countries between which the commerce is carried on.

Charged with the duty of legislating for the benefit of the American people, as we are, and friends to the new-born Republic of Cuba, desiring her prosperity, we recognize that this bill will, to some extent, relieve the unnecessary burdens upon both Americans and Cubans, enabling the Americans to buy Cuban products at more reasonable prices and enabling the Cubans to buy American products at more reasonable prices, thereby enlarging the volume of trade between the two countries in both directions.

We regret that the party in power has not seen its way to confer still further benefits upon citizens of both nations by providing for even freer and yet more untrammelled and unrestricted commerce between them. As long as the present party is in power we can perhaps hope for tariff reductions and revision only from reciprocity treaties. It is a piecemeal process, but it is better than no process at all. We hail it as a harbinger of future reciprocity treaties with other countries, especially those upon the American Continent, and notably our neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada.

Commercial wars are detrimental, sometimes destructive. They are wars in which there can not be a victor on either side—wars as a result of which both sides endure defeat. Friendly relations between peoples can not be as certainly secured in any other way as by the reciprocal benefits of trade and commerce. Men of different nations bound to one another by large and valuable trade relations are bound by the closest tie of a materialistic character known to human nature—the tie of self-interest. They have given a mutual bond to keep the peace, and strenuous "jingoism" itself hesitates, under such circumstances, to disturb it.

We recommend the passage of the amendment referred to above, and, failing in that, having filed our protest by voice and vote against the right or power to bind our future conduct, we still recommend the passage of the bill.

JOHN S. WILLIAMS.  
CLAUDE A. SWANSON.  
GEO. B. MCCLELLAN.  
CHAMP CLARK.

#### The views of Mr. COOPER of Texas are as follows:

Since filing my objections to the bill of the Fifty-seventh Congress (H. R. 12765) providing for commercial reciprocal relations with Cuba, I have carefully considered the subject further, from every point of view, with the result that my objections to the Cuban reciprocity project have become only strengthened and confirmed, and I can not approve or support the bill (H. R. 12765) reported in this extraordinary session of the Fifty-eighth Congress by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee.

In the light of all the facts and arguments pertaining to the subject, so far as I can apprehend and understand them, the bill and the purpose for which it is framed will not prove beneficial to the people of either Cuba or the United States, nor is the measure demanded by any considerations of honor, duty, or expediency; but, on the contrary, the bill, in my judgment, will tend, if enacted, to the injury of our own people, if not also the Cubans themselves.

At the outset, grave doubts as to the constitutionality of the bill present themselves. The subject-matter of the pending treaty, or "commercial convention," relates entirely to a question of revenue, and by the Constitution the initiative in all matters touching the revenue is given to the House of Representatives. Waiving the point as to the right of the Senate to exercise the treaty-making power when the treaty under consideration is one solely affecting the revenue, it is now claimed by the supporters of the proposed legislation that the right of the House of Representatives to the initiative in revenue matters is preserved in this case by the introduction of this bill in the House in lieu of similar initiative action in the Senate.

But it appears to me to be plainly a subterfuge to contend that this is a bill of the House, when its only purpose and effect is to ratify a treaty or law already perfected in form by the other branch of Congress, and practically already ratified in that branch, under the treaty-making power conferred by the Constitution, which treaty or law the House is now simply called upon by the majority to accept as a fait accompli, without any voice as to the wording of the original document, and even without the privilege of amending or modifying the terms laid down by its constructors. It certainly appears an unconstitutional proceeding thus to tie the hands of the House of Representatives in a matter of legislation affecting the revenue.

Aside from this point, the proposed reciprocity agreement, in my judgment, is open to many and strong objections on political and practical grounds.

The proposed reciprocity is both undemocratic and unrepugnant. It is undemocratic in that the Democratic theory of taxation is that all taxation should be equal and uniform, and that bounties or subsidies to certain favored individuals or interests are unjust and illegal. Reciprocity, in its very nature, is an indirect bounty or subsidy. In the case at issue the beneficiaries of the subsidy would be sugar-refining interests and some other special interests affected by the proposed tariff rebates, and the amount of benefit reaped by them would have to be made up for by taxation of the whole people upon some other articles not covered by the treaty.

The proposed reciprocity is unrepugnant in that it deliberately seeks to injure and interfere with a home industry by lowering tariff rates which protect that industry, and thus directly inviting and stimulating a rival foreign industry. It is repugnant only in so far as it is preferential and discriminating. It is a long step toward a free-trade South and a protected East and North, in that it trades off agricultural tariffs to secure foreign markets for the trusts in manufactured goods, an odious doctrine to a Democrat who believes in equal rights to all and special privileges to none; violative of the declaration of the Chicago Democratic platform of 1896, which declared for a tariff for revenue "so levied as not to discriminate against sections."

A reciprocity treaty of the nature of the pending treaty—a preferential compact between two individual nations—violates the fundamental principles of both Democracy and Republicanism. It violates both the tariff-for-revenue principle and the tariff-for-protection principle. In the present case

it violates the protection principle because it proposes to allow the introduction into this country, at reduced tariff rates, of large quantities of sugar and other commodities extensively produced in the United States. It violates the tariff-for-revenue principle because it deliberately lops off about \$8,000,000 of our annual revenue without benefit to the consumer, takes this amount out of our Treasury and gives it to certain favored beneficiaries, and compels our taxpayers to make up the deficiency thus arbitrarily created.

The bill, in its practical operation, can not benefit the consumer, the producer, or the Treasury. The increased output of sugar from Cuba will be controlled by the sugar trust, and it has been proved with sufficient conclusiveness that in all probability the benefits of the proposed rebate would be appropriated by the managers of the trust, and that even if a portion thereof should find their way to the producers in Cuba the Cubans themselves would not be benefited, because fully 70 per cent of the planters in the island are foreigners—Americans, Spaniards, Germans, etc.

The trust will continue to control not only the output and the producer, but also the price and the consumer. The increase of the inflow of sugar from Cuba will not in the least diminish the price to the American consumer. The price of sugar here depends on the world price, as fixed at Hamburg. It is not affected at all by the amount of the supply in our home market. The consumer would thus be without benefit in the way of reduced price of sugar, and would be positively injured by being compelled to pay taxes to the amount of about \$8,000,000 to make up the revenue diverted by this bill, or treaty, from the Treasury of the United States into the pockets of the managers of the sugar trust.

One of the strongest objections to the bill lies against the extraordinary supplemental provision prohibiting the House of Representatives from making any further reductions in the duty on sugar during the life of the treaty. In other words, if the House sanctions this instrument, and if the bill becomes a law, the House spontaneously abrogates its constitutional right to initiate alterations in the tariff on sugar, and binds itself not to make any such alterations in that tariff for at least five years to come. I can not but consider such a proposition as this, involving the surrender of the prerogatives and the abandonment of the duties of this branch of the Government, as being wholly unprecedented in its audacity.

I do not find that this country is under any moral obligation, expressed or implied, to enact this measure. There is nothing in the treaty of Paris or in the so-called Platt amendment calling for it. We have already done all, and much more than all, that we were in honor bound to do for the benefit of Cuba. There is nothing in law or in morals justifying the contention that Cuba is a political dependency of the United States, or that the United States is morally bound to insure and guarantee the success of the Cuban Republic. This theory is not only unsound, but also humiliating to both countries, and it is very properly resented and repudiated by the leading Cubans themselves.

The plea that this special favor to the Cubans should be granted as an act of charity or benevolence, because the Cubans are in desperate financial straits and on the verge of political collapse and commercial failure, is found on examination to be equally unsound. In fact, the Cubans are now exceedingly prosperous, and their success, both politically and commercially, is assured. This is proved by the most recent official publications of the Cuban authorities and also by numerous publications of our own Government, and also by the testimony of financial and commercial statistics gathered from many independent and impartial sources, not only in this country and Cuba but also in Europe.

The only great trouble confronting the Cubans is the low price of sugar, but this will be only partially met by the passage of this bill, and the only efficacious remedy for this trouble will be found in greater diversification of crops in Cuba, and a turning over of certain portions of the Cuban sugar lands to the production of coffee, fruits, etc., even as these same lands were formerly turned over from coffee to sugar production when the prices of sugar ran very high.

Cuba's foreign trade has gone up from about \$50,000,000 in 1896 and 1897 to about \$125,000,000 in 1902, and will in all probability amount to at least \$150,000,000 in the calendar year 1903. It is increasing of late by leaps and bounds. The exports of Cuban sugar to this country in the fiscal year 1902 were 439,000 tons, and in the fiscal year 1903 they were more than 1,000,000 tons. The value of the tobacco export from Cuba to this country in 1902 was less than \$11,000,000, while that of the present year has exceeded \$13,000,000. The export of pineapples and other fruits from Cuba has doubled since 1902. The value of Cuban products and exports in the line of mineral ores, lumber, etc., is increasing annually at a rapid rate.

Between 1899 and 1903 Cuba's total exports of sugar and molasses have increased in value from \$19,000,000 to over \$30,000,000; of tobacco from \$21,000,000 to \$25,000,000; of iron ore, asphalt, and other mineral products from \$500,000 to \$2,000,000; of fruits and vegetables from \$800,000 to \$1,900,000, and of all kinds of merchandise from \$45,000,000 to \$65,000,000 in 1902, with a certainty of a great further advance in 1903.

This expansion of Cuba's foreign trade is not only with this country, but with the European countries. The statistics show that between 1899 and 1902 Cuba's exports to the United Kingdom increased more than 100 per cent, and her exports to Germany more than 150 per cent. Altogether, Cuba seems to be doing very well and not to be in pressing need of any special benevolences.

Legislation such as is proposed in this bill will assuredly anger and alienate other friendly powers. It is a measure expressly calculated and intended to assist this country and one other country at the expense of all the other countries. If it should prove of material benefit to Cuba and the United States in any respect, in so far it would prove proportionally injurious to the other nations. I can not see how we should gain by courting a little additional trade with Cuba, if we thereby invite retaliation and reprisals by other nations.

There is nothing going to prove that our export trade to Cuba would be materially benefited by the proposed legislation. Our exports to Cuba now are as large, if not larger than they were under the reciprocity of 1891-1894. The Cuban tariff is low, and affords no material bar to the purchase by the Cubans of anything they want, in whatever market their tastes are best suited. With or without reciprocity, they will continue buying their shoes from Spain and their textile goods from England, because they fancy those products.

This bill does not require Cuba to enact stringent immigration laws, like those of the United States. As a consequence, cheap labor will naturally gravitate to Cuba and produce sugar there in competition with the high-priced labor of the United States.

In thus presenting some of my principal objections to the pending bill and treaty, I wish to include, in conclusion, the views which I offered in opposition to the previous reciprocity bill (H. R. 12765) on the 5th of April, 1902, as follows:

#### MINORITY VIEWS. [To accompany H. R. 12765.]

After giving due attention to the evidence submitted to the Ways and Means Committee in support of and in opposition to legislation proposed by the President and Governor-General Wood for the benefit of Cuba, I am unable to give my support to the bill reported by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee.

In my judgment the bill as reported does not commend itself to the judgment of anyone at interest and will not be effective for any good purpose.



whatever, while it is open to many serious objections. Had the Ways and Means Committee reported a bill removing the differential in favor of refined sugar, which differential gives the American Sugar Refining Company, commonly called the "sugar trust," a monopoly, enabling it to fix the price of raw sugar to the producer and refined sugar to the consumer, and had the bill proposed to give any relief to the consumer, I would gladly have supported the bill accompanied with a proper reduction upon the present tariff upon sugar.

The form in which the bill has been reported has converted a pretended sympathy for Cuba into a measure which will not be of benefit to Cuba, will not relieve the American consumer from taxation, or lessen the cost of his consumption, but redound largely to the interest of the "sugar trust" and other "manufacturing trusts" at the expense of American agricultural and horticultural interests. I submit—

First. That the reduction of 20 per cent upon the sugar schedule, as proposed by the bill, will be of no practical benefit to the Cubans, and with this statement President Roosevelt, Governor-General Wood, and other advocates of a reduction in our tariff upon sugar are agreed.

Second. That there is no such distress in Cuba as to demand any change in our tariff laws, and this statement is derived from a fair analysis of all the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee.

Third. This Government is under no obligations, by reason of the Platt amendment, to make tariff concessions to Cuba not made to all other countries alike. We have expended \$250,000,000 in giving Cuba her liberty, and the conditions imposed upon her do not prevent the making of commercial treaties with any other country. In fact, the total production of sugar in Cuba to-day finds a market in the United States simply because, even under present tariff laws, she receives more for her sugar here than she could elsewhere.

Fourth. No reduction in taxation upon the American consumer will be had should the proposed bill become a law, and it is not contended by any person well informed that the consumer will pay any less here by reason of the proposed reduction. The present differential in favor of refined sugar prohibits the refining of sugar in Cuba, and compels the shipment of her sugar in a raw state to this country, where the "sugar trust" is the chief purchaser. It is not believed that the trust will give Cuba the benefit of this reduction. On the contrary, it is more likely, the price of sugar being fixed in Hamburg, that the "sugar trust" will not only pocket this reduction, but will use it as a club to compel the producers of sugar in the United States to sell their raw sugar to the trust at an equivalent reduction without any concession whatever to the consumer.

Fifth. The proposed bill will simply take from the Federal Treasury about \$5,000,000 of annual revenue and transfer it to the coffers of the "sugar trust," without relief from excessive taxation to the citizens of the United States or benefit to the consumers of sugar.

Sixth. It inaugurates the policy of reciprocity, which, as now advocated by the Republican party, is as undemocratic as a tariff for protection, and which has been aptly called "the handmaiden of protection." The Democratic view has always been that tariffs should be laid fairly and equitably to raise revenue for the support of the Government. It is as much a perversion of the taxing power to use it as a means to dicker and barter with other countries as it is to use it to protect favored industries against foreign competition. Tariffs should be framed for revenue and should be applied to all nations alike, enabling them to trade with us upon terms of equality. Instead of "Peace, amity, and commerce with all nations, entangling alliances with none," we will enter upon a policy provocative of jealousies, dissensions, reprisals, and retaliation by foreign powers toward this country, and in the vortex tariff reform and tariff for revenue will be lost sight of, to be supplanted by unscientific, unfair, and unequal tariff schedules. Reciprocity trade relations will necessarily result in a struggle here upon the part of powerful industries to obtain trade concessions abroad at the expense of other industries which are less powerful at court, and in such a contest the powerful interests will be supreme and the weaker "go to the wall." As tersely stated by a distinguished member of Congress, "Free trade for the farmer, protection for the trusts."

Seventh. The proposed bill is not a revenue measure, not a reduction of taxation, but a bill to give double protection to the great interests which refuse to reduce their exactions upon the American people. The present extravagantly high protective tariff is maintained in favor of all the great trusts in the United States, which are now selling abroad for less than they are selling at home, and still shields them from foreign competition here, while Cuba is required to give them a differential of 20 per cent against all other countries to protect them there.

Eighth. The proposed bill will force Cuba to abandon her present revenue tariff and adopt a protective system, and that, too, not for her own benefit, but at the cost of her consumers, to protect American manufacturers against foreign competition in the Cuban market. The present tariff in force in Cuba is purely a revenue measure, and yields barely sufficient for her purposes. If this bill becomes a law, Cuba will be compelled to meet its provisions, not by reducing her tariff upon imports from the United States, but by raising her tariff upon the products of countries other than the United States brought into Cuba, and the Democrat who votes for this bill will vote for a measure which takes millions of dollars out of the Federal Treasury and presents it to the "sugar trust" without a dollar's benefit to the American consumer, and to force Cuba to abandon a tariff for revenue only and adopt a protective-tariff system for the benefit of the greedy interests which have fattened upon exactions wrung from our citizens, and whose rapacity now reaches out to oppress the Cubans under the guise of "a measure to relieve distress."

S. B. COOPER.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill H. R. 1963, to increase the membership of the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, was changed from the Committee on Claims to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the secretary of Hawaii, relating to the transmission of the laws and journals of the legislature of the Territory—to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the secretary of New Mexico, transmitting a copy of a memorial on the subject of good roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

A letter from the mayor of Tacoma, transmitting a copy of a memorial of the people of that city in relation to the treatment of Hebrews at Kischineff—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A letter from D. P. Ballard, preferring charges against the governor of the Central Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Joint resolution of the legislature of Hawaii, protesting against making a portion of that Territory a national home for lepers—to the Committee on the Territories.

Joint resolution of the legislature of Hawaii, asking an amendment to the laws relating to the use of the Hawaiian language—to the Committee on the Territories.

Joint resolution of the legislature of Hawaii, asking for appropriations for the improvement of the harbors of Honolulu and Hilo—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Joint resolution of the legislature of Hawaii, asking legislation for the furtherance of education in the Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Joint resolution of the Territory of Hawaii, asking that the people of that Territory be enabled to organize a State government—to the Committee on the Territories.

Joint resolution of the legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of submitting to the States for ratification an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Memorial of James W. M. Newlin, preferring charges against Andrew Kirkpatrick, United States judge for New Jersey—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of a board appointed to recommend a site for a naval magazine—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of a communication from the vice-president and general manager of the Commercial Pacific Cable Company, relative to legislation desired for the Midway Islands—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902, on behalf of the minority of said committee, submitted their views (Report No. 1, part 2); which said views of the minority were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COOPER of Texas, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902, submitted his views (Report No. 1, part 3); which said views were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 2863) for the relief of assistant surgeons in the Volunteer Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 2864) to amend section 1 of chapter 538 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2865) to provide for the erection of a public building at Eagle Pass, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 2866) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved April 24, 1888—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 2867) to pension all soldiers and sailors who served in the Army or Navy of the United States ninety days in war of the rebellion, and who were honorably discharged therefrom, at the rate of \$12 per month, and also placing



on the pension roll of the United States the widows of such soldiers and sailors who were married prior to June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 2868) for the opening of a street in Mount Pleasant, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 2869) granting pensions to army locomotive engineers, and providing pensions to widows and minor children of army locomotive engineers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 2870) to provide for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the Oregon country by Capts. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark during their expedition from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806, and to authorize a commission representing the United States to hold at the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon, a national, international, and oriental exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the rivers, soil, mine, forest, and sea in said State; and to provide and assist in the erection of a memorial building in said city of Portland, to be known as the Lewis and Clark Memorial Building, and to authorize an appropriation for all said purposes—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 2872) to punish lynching of aliens—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANNING: A bill (H. R. 2873) in regard to a monumental column to commemorate the battle of Princeton, and appropriating \$30,000 therefor—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 2874) to provide for the annual pro rata distribution of the annuities of the Sac and Fox Indians of the Mississippi between the two branches of the tribe, and to adjust the existing claims between said branches of the tribe as to said annuities—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 2875) to provide for the erection of a monument to Maj. Gen. Thomas Sumter—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 2876) providing for payment of funeral expenses of certain pensioners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 2877) in amendment of section 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2878) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 2879) to validate certain certificates of soldiers' additional homestead right—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2880) to make the port of Gloucester, Mass., a port of entry for merchandise—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 2881) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2882) to protect merchants and traders from oppression by trusts and combines—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 2883) to provide a site and erect a public building in Monroe, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 2884) to amend section 3296, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 2885) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 2886) to promote the circulation of reading matter among the blind—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2887) providing for the erection of a public building at Trenton, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) providing for the erection of a public building at Brookfield, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2889) providing for the erection of a public building at Chillicothe, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2890) providing for the erection of a public

building at Carrollton, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 2891) to amend an act entitled "An act to permit the Pintsch Compressing Company to lay pipes in certain streets in the city of Washington," approved May 19, 1896—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2892) further regulating the class of matter denied admission to the mail—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2893) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Springfield, Tenn., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2894) authorizing the improvement of the Black Warrior River above Tuscaloosa, Ala., between Lock and Dam No. 4 and Valley River, and the improvement of Valley River, Alabama, from its mouth to McAdory—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 2895) amending the act of January 26, 1897, entitled "An act for the relief of telegraph operators who served in the war of the rebellion"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 2896) to provide for the construction of a public building at Oregon City, Ore.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2897) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2898) providing for a life-saving station at the entrance to Tillamook Bay, in Oregon, and for life-saving crew, and so forth—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2899) extending the privilege of bounty land to persons in the Indian wars of the United States subsequent to March 3, 1855—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2900) to limit the character of lands selected in lieu of lands covered by unperfected bona fide claims or patents within public forest reservations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DICK: A bill (H. R. 2901) for a public building at Ash-tabula, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2902) for an additional appropriation for a public building at Warren, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 2903) to establish a subtreasury at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 2936) requiring corporations operating street railways within the District of Columbia to equip open cars with guard rails, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 3537) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 3538) for the erection of a public building in the city of Marietta, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3539) to retire on full pay certain disabled persons from the United States Light-House Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States from Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 3541) to authorize the purchase of the statue "America," by Cyrus Cobb—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 3542) to provide for the building of a public avenue on the south side of the Potomac River from the city of Washington to Mount Vernon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to certain persons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 32) proposing an amendment to the Constitution fixing the terms of the President at six years—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 33) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 34) proposing to amend the Constitution by repealing the fifteenth amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution by providing that all of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment, except its first sentence, shall be repealed—to



the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MORRELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) providing that money heretofore appropriated for a 30-foot channel in the Delaware River be applied for the construction of a 35-foot channel in same river—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 6) providing for a survey of the Delaware River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 7) that there be published and bound 10,000 copies of state papers and correspondence bearing upon the purchase of the territory Louisiana—to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 2871) to incorporate the Mutual Investment Fire Insurance Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 2904) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Patman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2905) granting a pension to Mrs. Penny F. Stevens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2906) granting a pension to Ruetha Moran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2907) granting a pension to John McMichael—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2908) granting a pension to Simeon D. Pope—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2909) granting a pension to Elcy R. Kelly—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2910) granting a pension to James L. Strickland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2911) granting a pension to Mrs. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2912) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2913) granting increase of pension to R. H. Woods—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2914) granting an increase of pension to Charity M. Farmer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2915) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. M. E. Norwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2916) granting an increase of pension to Francis S. Howard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2917) for the relief of legal representatives of Anderson Abercrombie—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 2918) granting an increase of pension to Charles V. Billig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2919) granting a pension to Mary Robison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 2920) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2921) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Ashley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2922) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2923) granting an increase of pension to John G. Fairchild—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2924) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Crowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2925) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2926) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian C. Goss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2927) granting an increase of pension to James C. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 2928) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bushman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: A bill (H. R. 2929) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2930) granting an increase of pension to L. M. Greene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2931) to remove the charge of desertion against Robert Burnet—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2932) granting a pension to Dudley R. W. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2933) granting a pension to Mary A. Morey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2934) granting a pension to Mary E. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 2935) for the relief of Enoch Echord—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2936) for the relief of Michael Devine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2937) granting a pension to Joseph L. Faris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2938) granting a pension to Andrew Garrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2939) granting a pension to John Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2940) granting an increase of pension to Hester Ann Hanback—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2941) granting an increase of pension to W. J. Lockhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2942) granting an increase of pension to John M. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2943) granting an increase of pension to Jacob I. Levi—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2944) granting an increase of pension to Lewis T. Holstein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 2945) for the relief of Henry O. Bassett, heir of Henry Opeman Bassett, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2946) granting an increase of pension to Albert Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 2947) granting an increase of pension to William F. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 2948) granting an increase of pension to John Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 2949) granting a pension to Alexander M. Proctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2950) to remove charge of desertion from the record of Eli Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2951) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of James Baldwin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2952) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of Henry E. Cady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2953) to remove charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew S. Abbott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 2954) for the relief of John Nay—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2955) for the relief of Henry P. Mayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2956) for the relief of Gideon C. Corley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2957) for the relief of Benjamin F. Harrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2958) for the relief of Jacob W. Hudson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2959) for the relief of Maramon A. Martin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2960) for the relief of John Burns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2961) for the relief of John W. Vandine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2962) for the relief of Alexander Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2963) for the relief of Robert R. Furbey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2964) for the relief of Thomas C. Sweeney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2965) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2966) granting an increase of pension to Beckwith A. McNemar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2967) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2968) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Burrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2969) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2970) to restore to the pension roll the name of Andrew C. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2971) granting a pension to John Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2972) granting a pension to J. P. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 2973) granting a pension to Eliza J. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2974) granting a pension to Walter Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2975) granting a pension to Mary D. Duval—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2976) granting a pension to Enoch J. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2977) granting a pension to Rachel E. Newell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2978) granting a pension to Sarah F. Armstrong—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2979) granting a pension to Mary E. Radcliffe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2980) granting a pension to F. S. Snodgrass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2981) granting a pension to William Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2982) to pension R. J. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2983) granting a pension to William P. Parrill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2984) to pension James Logston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2985) to pension Wilson Johnston, of Wheeling, Ohio County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2986) granting a pension to Thomas S. Magruder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2987) to grant a pension to James S. Peery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 2988) granting an increase of pension to Philip Graulich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2989) to correct the military record of Louis Dye—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 2990) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Sherwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2991) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Topping—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2992) granting an increase of pension to Solomon B. Umphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2993) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2994) granting an increase of pension to Minnie H. Eaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2995) granting a pension to Mary Korth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 2996) restoring the name of Henry L. Beck to the army rolls as captain, and providing that he then be placed on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2997) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernard Steuber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2998) granting a pension to Abraham Shoff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2999) granting an increase of pension to Jane Davison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3000) granting an increase of pension to William C. Best—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3001) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Converse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 3002) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Tillinghast—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3003) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Greene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 3004) granting an increase of pension to John O. McNabb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3005) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Strumphord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3006) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Denny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3007) granting an increase of pension to Philip Hawn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3008) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Etnire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3009) granting an increase of pension to Elias Corns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3010) granting an increase of pension to William W. Storks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3011) granting an increase of pension to Philip Duttonhaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3012) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Gross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3013) granting an increase of pension to John A. Mavity—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3014) granting a pension to Louis Melcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3015) granting a pension to Horace Stambaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to William Simmons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3017) granting a pension to Patrick Feeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3018) increasing the pension of William D. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3019) granting a pension to Henry Mackey, alias Mackrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3020) to correct the military record of Daniel R. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3021) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. McIntyre—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3022) to correct the military record of James Donnallan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3023) for the relief of Frank Lincoln—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3024) for the relief of Erick Haugen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3025) granting a pension to David Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3026) granting a pension to Fred Hugaboom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3027) granting an increase of pension to William H. Vickers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3028) granting an increase of pension to Jane McManus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3029) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3030) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3031) granting an increase of pension to James K. Van Matre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIELS: A bill (H. R. 3032) granting an increase of pension to William Pittenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3033) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3034) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3035) granting an increase of pension to William D. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 3036) granting an increase of pension to William H. Romaine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENNY: A bill (H. R. 3037) granting a pension to William Bieber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3038) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert C. Hoggins, and for the relief of his widow and children—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3039) granting a pension to J. H. Oney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3040) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Stowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3041) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pillow—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3042) granting increase of pension to James M. Kercheval—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3043) for the relief of the estate of John J. Hamel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3044) for the relief of Daniel Collins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3045) for the relief of Robert G. Throne and the estate of A. G. Adams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3046) for the relief of John M. Lea—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3047) for the relief of Cave Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3048) for the relief of William N. Bilbo, jr., administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3049) for the relief of William J. Thomas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3050) for the relief of James E. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3051) for the relief of Sarah McClay, administratrix of Robert McClay, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3052) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Clarksville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3053) for the relief of Payne, James & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3054) for the relief of Della Sinnott and Adine Price, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3055) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Frith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3056) for the relief of Susan N. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3057) for the relief of Kinney, McLaughlin & Co., and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3058) for the relief of W. T. Garrett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3059) for the relief of Elizabeth J. Cleveland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3060) for the relief of Tusculum Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3061) granting an increase of pension to John Herschel Hardy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3062) granting an increase of pension to John A. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3063) providing for the payment of a bounty to the surviving members of the Seventeenth unattached company, Massachusetts Heavy Artillery, and to the widows of deceased members—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 3064) granting a pension to Mrs. Kate Good—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 3065) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Frank Averill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3066) to pay Velvia Tucker arrears of pension due her father, William N. Tucker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3067) granting restoration of former rate of pension to John Holverson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) to establish a record of the service of Charles J. Werner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3069) granting a pension to Amos O. Rowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3070) granting a pension to Edward Hogan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3071) granting a pension to Elizabeth Kimball—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3072) granting a pension to Daniel P. Andrus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3073) granting a pension to Edgar N. Sleeper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3074) granting a pension to Addison L. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3075) granting a pension to Warren Casaday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) granting a pension to Alice A. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) granting a pension to Frank Smidt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) granting a pension to A. O. Doolittle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) granting a pension to Francis E. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3080) granting a pension to David P. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3081) granting a pension to Martha T. Cheney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) granting a pension to Byron C. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3083) granting a pension to John Lossing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3084) granting a pension to Henry Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3085) granting a pension to Henry Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3086) granting a pension to Julia A. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3087) for the relief of C. S. Stilwell, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3088) for the relief of David L. Dorland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of Hiram Marlett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) for the relief of James Curran—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3091) for the relief of Robert McFarland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) for the relief of Daniel Kuhn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3093) for the relief of Henry Crangle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3094) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3095) granting an increase of pension to John F. Riegel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3096) granting an increase of pension to William W. Dennis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3097) granting an increase of pension to Brinsley Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) granting an increase of pension to George Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) granting an increase of pension to Alvin S. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3100) granting an increase of pension to Edwin H. Tyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) granting an increase of pension to William E. Haskins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) granting an increase of pension to John L. Cease—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) granting an increase of pension to John A. Sherwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3105) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Gaylord—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 3106) granting an increase of pension to James Hannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) granting an increase of pension to James E. Chappell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) granting an increase of pension to John Bilderback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 3109) for the relief of Noah Dillard—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 3110) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Kline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Hardy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3112) for the relief of Green Clay Gardner, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3113) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Stout MacIntosh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3114) for the relief of Henry H. Curtis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 3115) granting a pension to John T. Curnette—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3116) granting a pension to David T. Curnette—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) granting a pension to Robert Bartee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) granting a pension to William Justice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) granting a pension to James H. Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) granting a pension to Henderson Boggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) granting a pension to Francis B. Trussell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3122) granting a pension to Jacob R. Compton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) granting a pension to Daniel Pack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) granting a pension to Samuel Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3125) granting a pension to James H. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3126) granting a pension to Lewis Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3127) granting a pension to John B. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3128) granting a pension to George W. Hines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3129) granting a pension to Henry C. Haywood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3130) granting a pension to D. J. Casey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3131) granting a pension to Andrew Cooksey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3132) granting a pension to Jesse Cordial—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3133) granting a pension to William Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3134) granting a pension to Isaac Pack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) granting a pension to Presley Monson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3136) granting a pension to Patterson Moore, alias Andrew Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3137) granting a pension to Martin P. Sexton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3138) granting a pension to Lyman Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3139) granting a pension to Louisa Borders, Gemima Borders, William Borders, Monroe Borders, John Borders, and Norah Borders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3140) granting a pension to Nannie M. Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3141) granting a pension to William Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3142) granting a pension to William Fraley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3143) granting a pension to Mary Jane French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3144) granting a pension to Martin Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3145) granting a pension to John H. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3146) granting a pension to James H. Jobe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3147) granting a pension to Lois Van Thom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3148) granting a pension to Julia G. Murphy, foster mother of Albert J. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3149) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Mavity—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3150) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gilbride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3151) granting an increase of pension to William N. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3152) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3153) granting an increase of pension to John R. Hyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3154) granting an increase of pension to C. L. Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3155) granting an increase of pension to David Gosman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3156) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Davis, widow of William Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3157) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Keibler, widow of Henry Keibler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3158) granting an increase of pension to Maggie H. Campbell, widow of Henry G. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) granting an increase of pension to David Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3160) granting an increase of pension to Christian Bothman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3161) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Overley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin B. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3163) granting an increase of pension to James Plummer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3164) granting an increase of pension to Diana G. Halley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3165) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hartley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) granting an increase of pension to James M. Howe—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3167) granting an increase of pension to James Littleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3168) granting an increase of pension to Ferguson Logan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3169) granting an increase of pension to James R. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) granting an increase of pension to John Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3171) granting an increase of pension to G. N. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Pogue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) granting an increase of pension to Henderson Pennington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3174) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Pierce, widow of Frank H. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) granting an increase of pension to James H. Pemberton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3176) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Schell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3178) granting an increase of pension to Robert Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3179) granting an increase of pension to Greenberry Sexton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3180) granting an increase of pension to James F. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3181) granting an increase of pension to I. J. Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3182) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah McDaniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3183) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3184) granting an increase of pension to Louisa January—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3185) granting an increase of pension to George W. Enyart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3186) granting an increase of pension to Israel T. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) granting an increase of pension to John O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3188) for the relief of Thomas H. Stapleton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3189) for the relief of Jeremiah Cracraft—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3190) for the relief of Gordon McCormick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) for the relief of William J. Meadows—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) for the relief of Mary Lock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of Martin Lunsford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) for the relief of Turman V. Cremeans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) for the relief of Margaret Morarity—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) for the relief of William E. Sheppard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) for the relief of Charles Sharpe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) for the relief of Duncan Scott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3199) for the relief of Simon R. Hampton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3200) for the relief of Joseph B. McClintock—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3201) for the relief of John McGowan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3202) for the relief of George S. McKee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3203) for the relief of Baldwin De Bell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3204) for the relief of I. B. Bratton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) for the relief of George W. Ingram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3206) for the relief of Robert Ross—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) for the relief of James H. C. Mann—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3208) for the relief of Joseph M. Wilburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3209) for the relief of William G. Gardner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3210) for the relief of Jeremiah Hunt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Marcus L. Broadwell—to the Committee on War Claims.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3212) for the relief of the estate of Ann S. Jackson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3213) for the relief of James S. Frizzell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3214) for the relief of Ann Stewart, administratrix of William Stewart, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) for the relief of Thomas V. Stirman's estate—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) for the relief of James C. Brickley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) for the relief of James H. Reeder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) for the relief of Erwin Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) for the relief of Henry Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3220) for the relief of James T. Downey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3221) for the relief of Thomas C. Isgrigg—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3222) for the relief of Bath County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) for the relief of Lewis Tachet—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3224) for the relief of Thomas B. Pickrell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3225) for the relief of A. D. Keffer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3226) for the relief of the estate of R. M. McClelland, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3227) for the relief of Frank Hanson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) for the relief of Jephtha Holden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Asa Day—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3230) for the relief of Townley H. Bellomy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) for the relief of R. H. Meek—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3232) for the relief of Allen Conley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3233) for the relief of Eli F. Prather—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 3234) granting an increase of pension to James H. Rickard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3235) for the relief of Walter F. Suiter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3236) to correct military record of Shubal H. Breed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 3237) for the relief of Priscilla R. Burns—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 3238) for the relief of the widow and children of Daniel McDonough, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 3239) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) granting a pension to Helen A. Scholes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Mohler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Overstreet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) granting an increase of pension to Warren Closson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Kimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3245) for the relief of heirs of Tellisse W. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3246) granting a pension to Mrs. Hedwig A. Maas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 3247) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 3248) granting a pension to Charles C. Jeffers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) granting an increase of pension to John G. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) granting an increase of pension to John S. Benjamin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) granting an increase of pension to Robert Buckner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) granting an increase of pension to William T. Shively—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) granting an increase of pension to Howell W. Kenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3254) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Snowden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 3255) for extra compensation to Capt. John Stewart—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 3256) directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn by Thomas J. Hobbs, disbursing clerk, in favor of Crane & Co., of Dalton, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 3257) for the relief of the estate of Anton Borchert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3258) for the relief of Mary A. Bell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3259) for the relief of Mrs. S. A. Penniman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3260) for the relief of Jacob Cohen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3261) for the relief of James W. Bellah, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3262) for the relief of Alexander J. Thompson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3263) for the relief of the heirs of Richard B. Sconyers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) for the relief of the Importing and Exporting Company of the State of Georgia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3265) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Cook, widow of Thomas Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3266) granting a pension to Rev. James M. Simms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3267) granting a pension to Jane Day—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3268) granting a pension to James H. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 3269) granting a pension to Eliza A. Camp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3270) granting a pension to Charles W. Atkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 3271) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Teter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3272) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hardy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3273) granting an increase of pension to William E. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 3274) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Frank C. Whitney—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3275) granting an increase of pension to Nellie P. Coyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3276) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Maddocks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3277) granting an increase of pension to Algernon E. Castner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3278) granting an increase of pension to Edwin L. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3279) granting an increase of pension to Elvira P. Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3280) granting an increase of pension to H. M. Blackwell, alias Levi W. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3281) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Noyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3282) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Harding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3283) granting an increase of pension to T. A. Hodgdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3284) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon D. O. Lord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3285) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3286) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3287) granting an increase of pension to Orrin Plaisted—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) granting an increase of pension to N. L. Meands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus M. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3290) granting an increase of pension to Almena S. Willoughby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3291) granting a pension to Catherine M. Savory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3292) granting a pension to Joshua Daggett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3293) granting a pension to Priscilla A. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3294) granting a pension to Cornelia M. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3295) granting a pension to Charity Durgin, daughter of Samuel Durgin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3296) granting a pension to Kingsbury P. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3297) granting a pension to Emily A. Trask, guardian of Renel W. Trask—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3298) granting a pension to Mary E. Pennock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3299) granting a pension to Medie M. Flanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3300) granting a pension to Josephine Hussey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 3301) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow a medal of honor upon Maj. J. O. Skinner, surgeon, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 3303) for the relief of the trustees of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, of Marietta, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3304) for the relief of William Shepherd—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3305) for the relief of Henry G. Stoffregen, executor of H. G. Peter's estate—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3306) for the relief of the First Presbyterian Church, Dalton, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3307) for the relief of the heirs of Elias Weaver—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3308) for the relief of the trustees, or their successors in office, of the Cherokee Baptist College, located in Cassville, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3309) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church (colored), corner of Fifth avenue and East Second street, at Rome, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 3310) to amend the military record of John H. Lamson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3311) to correct the military record of Seth Bonney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3312) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Julius F. Hill, alias Franklin J. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3313) granting an honorable discharge to James Woods—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) to pay Samuel M. Blair the sum of \$12,470—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3315) donating an obsolete mortar to the Somerville Historical Society—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Macarty—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) granting a pension to Antoinette I. Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3318) granting a pension to Adelaide M. McIntosh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3319) granting a pension to John D. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) granting a pension to Andrew L. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3321) granting a pension to George D'Vys—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3322) granting a pension to Lowell M. Maxham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3323) for the relief of Arthur R. Henderson—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3324) for the relief of Patrick J. Madden—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3325) for the relief of Paul D. Walbridge—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3326) for the relief of the legal representatives of Paul Curtis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3327) for the relief of Alexander Sutherland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3328) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Anderson L. Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3330) granting an increase of pension to Rose Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3331) granting an increase of pension to Bridget A. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3332) granting an increase of pension to George S. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3333) granting an increase of pension to Giles R. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3334) granting an increase of pension to Philip T. Greeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3335) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Lauriat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3336) granting an increase of pension to Edson D. Bemis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Craigue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3338) to correct the military record of James Williamson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3339) to amend the military record of Henry Quick—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 3340) for the relief of William H. Quinn—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3341) for the relief of the estate of John T. Stringer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3342) for the relief of the estate of William H. Stringer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3343) to authorize the President to revoke the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, and to place the said William F. Godwin on the retired list with the rank of first lieutenant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3344) granting a pension to Emma Worrall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 3345) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Clarke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 3346) granting an increase of pension to Earl Vandegriff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 3347) for the relief of David B. Zorger and H. C. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3348) granting a pension to Martin P. Schaffner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3349) granting a pension to Kate E. Keiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3350) granting a pension to Elizabeth Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3351) granting a pension to Francis S. Griest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3352) granting a pension to Mary Idle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3353) granting a pension to Emma Handshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3354) granting a pension to Emma R. Rusling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3355) granting a pension to Thompson Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3356) granting a pension to John S. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3357) granting an increase of pension to William C. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Smink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus E. Salada—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) granting an increase of pension to Eunice Parke Detweiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3361) granting an increase of pension to Franklin T. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3362) granting an increase of pension to Adam Baum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3363) granting an increase of pension to Joanna R. Forster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3364) granting an increase of pension to James Appleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3365) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Dubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3366) granting an increase of pension to Lee P. Garrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kerby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) granting an increase of pension to Stephen W. Pomeroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3369) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Winters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Addams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3371) granting an increase of pension to David E. Longsdorf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3372) granting an increase of pension to Harry Beitzel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cochran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3374) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Garland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3375) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3376) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Layser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Billig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Leitzel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3379) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3380) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Francis Tomlinson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3381) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John F. Geist—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John F. Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) to remove the charges from the military record of M. G. Thornton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Reuben Seiler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Neidinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3386) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Windowmaker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3387) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Hawk—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3388) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3389) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Levi Sheetz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3390) to correct the military record of Alexander C. Landis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) to correct the military record of John W. Geiger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3392) authorizing and directing the payment to Mrs. George Dalton, of Pottsville, Pa., of the sum of \$300, together with the interest thereon, that was paid by the late George Dalton to avoid the draft in 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3393) for the relief of the Columbia Brewing Company, of Shenandoah, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3394) for the relief of Sadie Thome—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) to amend the military record of Joseph Moreheiser—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3396) removing charge of desertion from military record of John Lucid—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3397) removing charge of desertion from military record of Isaac Purnell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3398) removing charge of desertion from military record of John J. Muldowney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3399) granting a pension to Rebecca De Wald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3400) granting a pension to Elizabeth Charlesworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3401) granting an increase of pension to George Farne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3402) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Nagle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3403) granting an increase of pension to Condly Manelius—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3405) granting an increase of pension to Francis Garner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 3406) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Peaks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) granting an increase of pension to Frank Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) granting an increase of pension to John L. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 3409) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Stuart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3410) granting an increase of pension to John G. H. Armistead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3411) granting an increase of pension to William J. Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 3412) for the relief of the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 3413) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles W. Miller, alias Charles Nowack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) to remove the charge of desertion against Lewis Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3415) granting a pension to Taylor Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) granting a pension to James W. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) granting a pension to Mary A. Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3418) granting a pension to Franklin S. London—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) granting a pension to Archibald Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3420) granting a pension to Samuel T. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) granting a pension to Harmon Coffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) granting a pension to Jackson Lambert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) granting a pension to Hannah Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3424) granting a pension to John T. Burriss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 3425) granting a pension to Charles R. Hoag—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 3426) granting an increase of pension to George W. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) granting an increase of pension to Albert Fetterhoff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) granting an increase of pension to William McCraw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3430) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wolcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) granting an increase of pension to William Bassett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) granting an increase of pension to George A. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3434) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Parmley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) granting an increase of pension to John M. Pratt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3436) granting an increase of pension to James S. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3437) granting an increase of pension to William B. Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3438) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Burchett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3440) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Buckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) granting an increase of pension to Simeon McKinstry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3442) granting an increase of pension to T. H. B. Schooling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3443) granting an increase of pension to Elijah G. Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3444) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) granting an increase of pension to John P. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) to correct the military record of John P. Griffith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3447) to correct the military record of Ernst Ebert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) to correct the military record of John Loney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3449) to correct the military record of C. J. J. Martyr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3450) for the relief of McCarty & Collins—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3451) for the relief of Louis Benecke—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3452) for the relief of W. W. Tracy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3453) for the relief of Martin Daughenbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) for the relief of Mrs. Mollie Bissell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 3455) for the relief of the trustees of the First Baptist Church, of Jefferson City, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 3456) for the relief of W. W. Jackson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 3457) for the relief of the legal representatives of Dr. Thomas B. Waters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3458) for the relief of John Ballard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 3459) granting an increase of pension to Patterson Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3460) granting an increase of pension to Louis P. Anschutz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3461) granting a pension to Florence A. Klein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3462) to remove charge of desertion from the record of William L. Wiles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 3463) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3464) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas F. Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 3465) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Shovar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3466) granting an increase of pension to John F. McBride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3467) granting an increase of pension to Martin Kistner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3468) granting an increase of pension to Peter Whitmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3469) to increase the pension of Luman T. Van Tassel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3470) granting a pension to Sarah B. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3471) to increase the pension of John Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 3472) granting an increase of pension to Marcus E. Amsden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 3473) granting an increase of pension to Artemus Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 3474) for the relief of Mary Latham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3475) for the relief of Dr. A. Eubank—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3476) for the relief of Maria S. Poe, and to have her name put on pension roll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3477) confirming the title of James F. Hancock to the south half of the southeast quarter and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 26, township 17 south, range 6 west, in Jefferson County, Ala.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) authorizing Eli R. Jones to perfect his homestead entry to the southeast quarter of section 32, in township 18 south, of range 2 west, in Jefferson County, Ala.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) for the relief of J. L. Montgomery—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3480) for the relief of W. F. Eggleston, as executor of S. O. Eggleston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) for the relief of Andrew J. Blackburn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3482) for the relief of William M. Lindsay—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARNOCK: A bill (H. R. 3483) for the relief of W. S. Hammaker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3484) for the relief of F. D. Bain—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3485) for the relief of Joseph Swisher—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3486) for the relief of George W. Leonard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3487) for the relief of John W. White—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) for the relief of Jeremiah Cain—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3489) to give credit to Jacob Parrott for receiving first medal of honor for civil war services—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3490) to correct the military record of S. B. Ellsworth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3491) to correct the military record of Newton W. Reames—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3492) to correct the military record of Lanson Zane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3493) granting a pension to Jesse S. Bower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3494) granting a pension to Sarah E. Helpman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to Henry Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3496) granting a pension to Katherine Decker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3497) granting a pension to William Mixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3498) granting a pension to Cephas Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) granting a pension to Lovie E. Read—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3500) granting a pension to Silas Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3501) granting a pension to Isabell Maddox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) granting a pension to Norville J. Hannum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) granting a pension to Rachel Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3505) granting a pension to Letty J. Coplin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3506) granting a pension to William M. Love—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3507) granting an increase of pension to John Reily—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3508) granting an increase of pension to Marion P. Downey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3509) granting an increase of pension to George W. Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3510) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Whiteman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3511) granting an increase of pension to John W. Lackens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3512) granting an increase of pension to Joseph V. Stevenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3513) granting a pension to Martin C. Stillwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Maize—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) granting a pension to Mary Brelsford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3516) granting an increase of pension to William McManus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3517) granting an increase of pension to William Laucks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) granting an increase of pension to David J. Courter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3521) granting an increase of pension to John Hawker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3523) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) granting an increase of pension to Harmon Patch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Whips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3526) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3527) granting an increase of pension to Amos Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3528) granting an increase of pension to George A. Havel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 3529) for the relief of settlers on lands in Sherman County, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3530) to reimburse Capt. Sidney Layland, for sums paid by him while master of the United States transport *Mobile* in July and August, 1898—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 3531) granting a pension to Margaret P. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYNN: A bill (H. R. 3532) granting an increase of pension to William H. Franklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3533) granting an increase of pension to Capt. R. H. McIlroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3534) to correct the military record of Capt. Herman von Werthern—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) to grant honorable discharge to William A. Treadwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of the National Hay Association of Atlanta, Ga., relating to freight classification—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the board of directors of the Freight Bureau of the City of Atlanta, Ga., favoring passage of a law to prevent unjust discrimination in tariff rates between different sections and localities—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEIDLER: Papers to accompany bill to pension James C. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension George W. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of citizens of Lacygne, Kans., for passage of bill for relief of Enoch Echord—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolution of J. B. Whyman Post, No. 101, Grand Army of the Republic, Firth, Department of Nebraska, favoring passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Post No. 38, Grand Army of the Republic, Waverly, Department of Nebraska, favoring passage of service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 113, Lincoln, Nebr., favoring passage of eight-hour law, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Victor Vifquain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Resolution of Interstate Association of Ex-Prisoners of War, Baxter Springs, Kans., favoring service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of Local Union No. 320, United Mine Workers of America, of Westville, Ill., urging the passage of an eight-hour law, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolutions of Local Union No. 13, Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, of Providence, R. I., in favor of the eight-hour bill and the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. DANIELS: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Albert J. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of J. M. Hurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of William Pittenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of William D. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Protest of the National Cigar Leaf Tobacco Association against Cuban reciprocity treaty in its present form—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of select and common councils of Philadelphia, relating to a 35-foot channel for the Delaware River, port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 9, Troy, N. Y., against Cuban reciprocity—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers relating to locating military training school on the Nacimiento Rancho, at San Miguel, in Monterey and San Luis Obispo counties, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 1339) to pension Joseph P. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, for encouragement of the merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, address of Committee of State Insurance Commissioners, asking for laws against fraudulent insurance companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of Salisbury, Mass., for increase of pension of John A. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of John S. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Papers to accompany bill to pension John Bilderback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension James Hannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension James E. Chappell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: Resolution of Philadelphia Association Union Ex-United States Prisoners of War, favoring prisoners of war pension bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of Oskaloosa Division, No. 71, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, favoring passage of eight-hour law, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition to accompany bill to pension Elizabeth Hardy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition of John Stewart, for additional pay for extra service in relation to the suit of the United States against Morris et al., known as the "Potomac Flats case"—to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCCLARY of Minnesota: Resolution of M. G. Everman, of St. Peter, Minn., favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Simon Mix Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pipestone, Minn., favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Mitchell Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Madelia, Minn., favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, letter of Douglas A. Fiske, of Minneapolis, Minn., against the passage of the Cuban reciprocity bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of Harry J. Wills, of Paulding County, Ga., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of William W. Simpson, deceased, late of Polk County, Ga., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Levi Crow, deceased, late of Paulding County, Ga., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolution of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, in favor of encouraging American shipbuilding—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany bill for avenue to Mount Vernon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolution of select and common council of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to a 35-foot channel for Delaware River, port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Papers to accompany bill for relief of the legal representatives of Dr. Thomas B. Waters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPALDING: Protest of merchants of Edgeley, N. Dak., against passage of parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Frank E. Hunt and 18 other citizens of Redlake Falls, Minn., against passage of parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of J. D. Lifquist and 16 other citizens of Minnesota, against passage of parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the millers of North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota, favoring reciprocity between the United States and the Dominion of Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.